

Bay District Schools

St. Andrew School At Oakland Terrace



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

St. Andrew School At Oakland Terrace

2010 W 12TH ST, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kathryn Ostrenga

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

St. Andrew School At Oakland Terrace

2010 W 12TH ST, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2011-12	2011-12
Grade		

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of St. Andrew School, in participation with our families and the community, is committed to providing a safe learning environment that promotes each child's social/emotional and academic development through positive behavioral supports and research-based practices. All students are provided opportunities to develop and achieve according to their own strengths in preparation for integration into the least restrictive educational and social setting.

Provide the school's vision statement.

St. Andrew will provide a standard of excellence and positive supports in a safe environment where all students can achieve their full potential in academic, behavioral, and character development.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Branstetter, Janie	Principal	The Principal is the school leader, overseeing all facets of the institution. The Principal's role is to lead staff in the implementation of instructional practices, provide formal and informal feedback to staff, manage the operations of the facility and daily activities of the school, and to be the voice of the school in public,
Chace, Sara	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Chace is the 2nd grade team leader. She shares information from the leadership team with her colleagues and brings information back to Administration from her team.
Cummings, Kristin	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Cummings is our Title I Coordinator. She manages the Title I paperwork, assists in planning Title I parent events, documents Title I activities, attends Title I meetings, and assists Administration with any and all Title I processes.
Hair, Cassandra	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Hair is the 3rd grade team leader. She shares information from the leadership team with her colleagues and brings information back to Administration from her team.
Rockhill, Marsha	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Rockhill serves on the School Improvement Team. She assists with the development of the school improvement plan and attends School Advisory Council Meetings. Mrs. Rockhill is the music/art teacher and sees all the students in the school, providing a different viewpoint.
Willis-Mathis, Karen	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Mathis is the prek, K, 1 Team Leader. She shares information from the leadership team with her colleagues and brings information back to Administration from her team.
Machell, Tawnia	SAC Member	Ms. Machell, now Maschio, is the 4th grade team leader. She shares information from the leadership team with her colleagues and brings information back to Administration from her team. Mrs. Maschio has served as the SAC chair for the past 2 years and has been highly involved in the development of the School Improvement Plan
May, Sandra	Instructional Media	Ms. May is the Media Specialist and a member of the School Improvement Team. She sees all students providing a different viewpoint.
Story, Anika	Assistant Principal	Ms. Story is the Assistant Administrator. Like the Principal, Ms. Story is involved in all facets of the school. Her primary responsibilities include the school wide behavior program, buses, and facilities.
Parrish, Jackie	School Counselor	Mrs. Parrish serves on the leadership team as the School Guidance Counselor.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Breland, Debbie	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Breland is a 3rd grade teacher that is serving on the School Improvement Team this year.
Mcgehad, Angela	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Lee is the 5th Grade Team Leader. She shares information from the leadership team with her colleagues and brings information back to Administration from her team.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	4	18	12	15	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Attendance below 90 percent	3	12	8	5	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	1	7	5	5	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	10	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	6	4	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

27

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/30/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	3	8	4	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	9	5	7	16	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	0	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	5	3	3	7	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	3	8	4	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	9	5	7	16	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	0	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	5	3	3	7	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	55%	57%	0%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	59%	58%	0%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	57%	53%	0%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	56%	63%	0%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	54%	62%	0%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	51%	0%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	53%	53%	0%	44%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	4 (0)	18 (0)	12 (0)	15 (0)	14 (0)	17 (0)	80 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 (7)	12 (3)	8 (8)	5 (4)	6 (9)	11 (11)	45 (42)
One or more suspensions	1 (9)	7 (5)	5 (7)	5 (16)	8 (9)	4 (17)	30 (63)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	1 (1)	10 (1)	1 (0)	2 (3)	0 (3)	14 (8)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (12)	5 (0)	0 (20)	7 (32)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	43%	61%	-18%	58%	-15%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	25%	58%	-33%	58%	-33%
	2018	11%	51%	-40%	56%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2019	4%	56%	-52%	56%	-52%
	2018	3%	50%	-47%	55%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	62%	-16%	62%	-16%
	2018	48%	63%	-15%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	59%	-15%	64%	-20%
	2018	31%	59%	-28%	62%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	4%	54%	-50%	60%	-56%
	2018	13%	57%	-44%	61%	-48%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison				-27%		

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	8%	54%	-46%	53%	-45%
	2018	10%	54%	-44%	55%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison				-2%		
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	17		27	26		10				
BLK	20	9		14	18						
WHT	25	33		40	40						
FRL	17	19		28	28		6				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	20
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	100
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	15
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	35
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	20
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

All subgroups were low and well below the 41% benchmark. 5th grade ELA and the subgroup would be African American. 4 days in a row of FSA testing that included Monday testing. Under utilization of accommodations. The trend appears to be as students move up in the grades their stamina and performances declines.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

4th grade ELA. 4 days in a row of FSA testing that included Monday testing. The trend appears to be as the students move up in the grades their stamina and performance declines. Under utilization of accommodations.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

5th grade math at 56% difference. 4 days in a row of FSA testing that included Monday testing. Under utilization of accommodations. The trend appears to be as students move up in the grades their stamina and performances declines. Only exposed to the Math curriculum for 2 years.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

4th grade math. Teachers worked together to plan. Focused pacing schedules based upon standards that had not been covered due to the Hurricane

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance/Level 1 performance/course failures

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Behavioral Strategies-new system for calling assistance to classroom, positive referrals, trauma sensitive classrooms, Emotional Poverty Book Study, student data tracking systems
2. Maximizing the state testing schedule and students' accommodations
3. Attendance incentives-weekly attendance buck, monthly attendance parties, awards assemblies, social worker monitoring attendance, student data tracking system
4. Implementation of new reading series-EL, professional development, coaching, common planning, PLC processes
5. Managing mental health services-CAC provider, Florida Therapy provider, Social Worker, 2 new support positions, telemedicine, community care referral process, threat assessment team

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improving student academic performance
Rationale	State and District assessment data is well below State and District proficiency rates. Learning gains fell significantly in all 3 assessed grade levels.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	50% of St. Andrew School students will make learning gains based upon State/District assessment results for both ELA and Math. This outcome was selected because 50% learning gains would reach the Commendable School Improvement rating. We were only at 21% learning gains for 2019. We want all subgroups to reach the 50% learning gain benchmark.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tawnia Machell (machel@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Maximizing student accommodations on their IEPs. Utilize an optimal testing schedule. Implement new District ELA curriculum. Use the PLC process to plan and prepare for instruction in ELA and Math. Continue to individualize and differentiate instruction for our special needs students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We've seen evidence of better performance when students' accommodations are maximized and the testing schedule is optimal for student performance.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planning and preparation of the new EL Curriculum 2. Request has been made for an optimal testing schedule 3. Increase all staff knowledge of providing accommodations for testing in order to maximize the students' accommodations during test administration. 4. Continued planning and preparation for Eureka Math 5. Monitoring of all subgroups will occur weekly during teacher/student data chats, weekly PLC meetings, and quarterly administrator/teacher data chats through MAPs data, module assessments, and grades. 6. Administrator walk through process (Cord of 3), classroom walk throughs on site, and administration participation in PLC meetings.
Person Responsible	Janie Branstetter (bransjg@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Decreasing major behavioral incidents
Rationale	Increase in the number of students experiencing mental health issues resulting in major behavioral incidents. This is the focus of our school.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decrease major behavior incidents by 15%. We had an overall reduction of discipline referrals of 22%. We only had 11% reduction in major behavioral incidents, therefore the goal of 15% in majors.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Janie Branstetter (bransjg@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	New protocol for calls for assistance to the classrooms. Coordination between new mental health services
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This new protocol matches our trauma sensitive movement in meeting students where they are. It allows all staff to be more educated towards students precipitating factors that could be root cause of acting out behaviors.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developed and trained staff in new Call for Assistance Protocol 2. Staff development in trauma sensitive responses 3. Fully hire, if at all possible, all support positions to include Promise, counseling, and tele-medicine para, and additional crisis team support position 4. Continue morning meetings 5. Continue student data notebooks, teacher-student data chats, administration-teacher data chats
Person Responsible	Janie Branstetter (bransjg@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

We will continue to focus on attendance with weekly attendance buck, monthly attendance parties, social worker position to assist with monitoring attendance, positive phone calls, attendance spreadsheet.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

St Andrew plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders by inviting them to several school activities and sending home a monthly school newsletter. All of our students have an IEP meeting which provides a time so we can throughly communicate strengths,

weaknesses and goals with our families. We will actively call parents and community members who are interested in joining our School Advisory Council to personally invite them to our meetings. As we begin the year, we will have a Meet and Greet and Open House in September to meet families and share expectations. An education breakfast, Pastries with Parents, will be served to allow time for parents to learn parent portal and launchpad. We will also have family nights to include: STEM activities, FSA, curriculum, and parent conferences. These fall and spring parent conferences will be important to communicate classroom expectations, curriculum, assessments, standards and parent portal.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

St. Andrew has developed the Crisis Response Team consisting of counselors and support staff who ensure the social-emotional needs of all students are being met. Teachers can call for assistance when students are not responding to in-class interventions. Students who are displaying extreme physical and verbal loss of control are removed from the classroom environment for a short time to cool down. While removed from the classroom, members of the Crisis Response Team work with students to problem solve and offer emotional support. Many students participate in group counseling sessions as indicated on their Individualized Education Plans as well as individualized counseling with mental health providers. Students are taught social skills in the classroom and throughout the school day.

St. Andrew School has a guidance department that includes a school guidance counselor, an intervention teacher and a counselor. These staff members support the social-emotional needs of the students.

Beginning 2015-2016 a mentoring program was established. Since the 2015-2016 school year, there has been a focus on developing a multi-tiered system of supports for students not responding to the core behavior program. This system continues to be developed and revised. Within this system students have access to a check in/ check out procedure with a mentor staff member, frustration passes, preferred activities, and individualized plans,

St. Andrew School also has a PROMISE (Preventing Recidivism through Opportunities, Mentoring, Intervention, Support and Education) Room to help students Recover, Reflect and Return to classroom. This will provide enhanced pro-social skills, positive behavior supports and conflict resolution techniques. This room also serves as the in-school suspension room, a strategy to use in lieu of out of school suspension.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

St. Andrew School 5th graders transition to either New Horizons Learning Center or to their home middle school, if they demonstrate readiness. Articulation meetings are held in the spring to include parents, students and the receiving school. Pre-kindergarten is housed at St. Andrew thus creating a seamless transition.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

St. Andrew School is organized like most elementary schools with the exception of the focus on student's social, emotional, and behavioral needs. St. Andrew follows BDS curricular frameworks in all content areas as well is charged with the implementation of the Florida Standards. We abide by all BDS policy and procedures for assessment, school improvement and implementation of District and State initiatives for instruction, teacher evaluation and assessment. St. Andrew has been designated as a Title I school. St. Andrew School receives unit allocations from the District as well as support through IDEA funds. The school leadership consists of a principal and an Assistant Administrator. Leadership is distributed through 4 grade team leaders, Title I Coordinator and School Guidance Counselor. This oversight group meets monthly to oversee all operations and functions of the school. The grade chairs are the primary team that leads all curricular activities. Grades teams meet weekly to review data and plan instruction and assessment. The Special Area team oversees all components of the positive behavior support program, including daily behavior monitoring, rewards, incentives, earned Friday events, and crisis intervention. This team also meets weekly to review behavior data. The Threat Assessment Team is comprised of the Crisis Intervention Lead Teacher, Administration, Guidance and the Safe School Officer. This team meets weekly to review any threats of violence or threats of self harm.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

NA

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improving student academic performance	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Decreasing major behavioral incidents	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00