Country Oaks Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Country Oaks Elementary School

2052 NW EUCALYPTUS BLVD, Labelle, FL 33935

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=9&sc_id=1171294728

Demographics

Principal: Robin Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2019

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)	K-12 General 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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%) 2014-15: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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 Hendry 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

Country Oaks Elementary School

2052 NW EUCALYPTUS BLVD, Labelle, FL 33935

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=9&sc_id=1171294728

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	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	B	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hendry 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.

Growing Successful Leaders

Provide the school's vision statement.

We provide a positive and engaging learning environment, where student leaders own their learning toward academic proficiency.

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
Jones, Robin	Principal	
Coker, Susan	School Counselor	
Garcia, Elvira	Instructional Coach	
Harris, Ryan	Assistant Principal	

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	126	119	117	135	129	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	776
Attendance below 90 percent	28	18	20	21	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	9	15	15	18	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	43	42	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	6	2	5	23	22	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	0	1	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 7/12/2019

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	18	24	16	21	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	8	13	17	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	43	46	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	2	1	21	10	12	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	18	24	16	21	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	8	13	17	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	43	46	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	2	1	21	10	12	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	50%	50%	57%	45%	44%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	54%	58%	47%	48%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	50%	53%	45%	45%	52%
Math Achievement	52%	56%	63%	52%	48%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	62%	62%	61%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	45%	51%	45%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	44%	53%	52%	42%	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	126 (0)	119 (0)	117 (0)	135 (0)	129 (0)	150 (0)	776 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	28 (18)	18 (24)	20 (16)	21 (21)	22 (22)	21 (15)	130 (116)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (1)	4 (1)	6 (0)	6 (3)	19 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	16 (12)	9 (8)	15 (13)	15 (17)	18 (6)	11 (15)	84 (71)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	43 (43)	42 (46)	45 (34)	130 (123)

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	53%	47%	6%	58%	-5%
	2018	41%	44%	-3%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	48%	-2%	58%	-12%
	2018	49%	47%	2%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	48%	47%	1%	56%	-8%
	2018	51%	45%	6%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	52%	-7%	62%	-17%
	2018	42%	48%	-6%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	57%	-4%	64%	-11%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	53%	53%	0%	60%	-7%
	2018	66%	54%	12%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	41%	-8%	53%	-20%
	2018	53%	43%	10%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
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	27	40	33	33	51	38	14				
ELL	37	47	45	45	59	40	25				
BLK	43	33		43	54						
HSP	48	50	40	53	65	44	30				
WHT	57	56		54	59		65				
FRL	47	48	35	49	64	48	31				
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
SWD	27	42	35	34	50	41	33				
ELL	28	44	38	38	48	36	12				
BLK	20	43	33	23	52		30				
HSP	47	55	53	55	68	53	51				
WHT	62	60		68	63		67				
FRL	45	53	46	52	65	51	48				

| 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
SWD	29	41	27	30	41	35	42				
ELL	33	36	38	44	56	45	28				
BLK	24	50	43	39	58	45	43				
HSP	43	46	47	51	62	44	46				
WHT	69	53		65	56		81				
FRL	42	46	43	47	58	45	46				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	409
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

Science was our lowest scoring component on our state assessments. We lack rigorous standards-based assessments to track students mastery of the science standards. Students also need proficiency in other grades that provides the foundational content needed to show proficiency by 5th grade.

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

Science showed the greatest decline from the prior year's scores. Lack of formative assessments impacted instruction along with the implementation of new curriculum in other subject areas. Students were not targeted for remediation without rigorous assessments.

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.

Science represented a 20% gap between our score and the state average. We were at 33% proficiency and the state average was 53%. Curriculum and assessment data contributed to this gap in our data. Our data from our science assessments did not reflect any unusual data that would indicate deficiencies prior to assessments.

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

Our greatest improvement was in ELA, with a 2% increase overall. ELA has continued to be a focus for us, as we strive to meet and exceed the state average. We continue to work on the standards at each grade level and target students that are not meeting proficiency standards, based on formative assessments.

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

One area of concern is attendance. While attendance rates have improved compared to last year's data, our current K class has a higher rate of absence than in the past, and overall we need to see a decrease in the numbers. There has been a drastic increase in the students that are showing more than 1 warning sign from 2nd to 3rd grade.

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

1. Increase reading proficiency of those on grade level and bottom quartile to reach the state average, which will in turn support the increase of proficiency in other areas.
2. Increase overall math proficiency of those on grade level, and bottom quartile
3. Increase science proficiency
4. Monitor academic growth of our SWD students
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:	

#1	
Title	Increasing Reading proficiency to meet the state criteria
Rationale	We have continued to make gains in ELA, but our goal is to reach the state average or more. If we continue to make gains in ELA, it will support our other areas of focus.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA proficiency was 50% in 2019, and we want to increase it to the state average of 57%. This increase will filter down to increase our bottom quartile and our SWD students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will work on building on our standards based classroom instruction and targeting students that are not meeting current proficiency standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If students are showing growth and proficiency on the standards, and we are able to assess them accurately, it will transfer to FSA assessments.
Action Step	
Description	1. Set specific times in the master schedule to deliver the support instruction 2.Use iReady and STAR to identify students level of proficiency and use this to group for small groups. 3. Develop standards based instructional lessons and deliver in small groups 4. Incorporate standards based instruction in small group using grade-level research based materials 5. Track student growth and regroup as necessary based on deficiencies 6. Provide additional time to students in the bottom quartile for ELA instruction
Person Responsible	Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.net)

#2	
Title	Increasing proficiency for SWD students
Rationale	Based on FSA data our SWD students are not making enough academic growth to meet the federal index criteria.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will increase our percentage from 38% to 42%, of our SWD students making growth and proficiency on FSA for this year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using current assessments, we will target specific skills for our SWD students and give them some additional instructional support in those areas using research-based strategies and materials.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These students are given additional time and resources, but still struggle to make academic gains. Adding more time to work on ELA standards using different materials, will give them the additional support to the accommodations already in place. This will be a new approach using a different format with the same standards.

Action Step	
Description	1. Use current assessments to target areas needed for growth -- using iReady and STAR 2. Provide time in the master schedule to ensure that there is consistency 3. Bring stakeholders together and discuss the plan as we group students 4. Monitor student growth and adjust groups as needed, based on data results 5.
Person Responsible	Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.net)

#3	
Title	Increasing Science proficiency
Rationale	Science made the biggest drop in percentage points on last year's FSA scores. Its was way below the state average.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We aim to increase our science scores by 20%, for the upcoming year. This will raise our score from 36% to 56% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Incorporate more hands on science experiments and increase the amount of science that is done in the lower grades. We will also increase science instruction in other areas across the campus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students need the hands-on experience of completing experiments and be able to create and test hypothesis that are based on the standards at the appropriate grade level. They also need exposure to the vocabulary and content applied in context.

Action Step	
Description	1. Revisit content taught at the lower grade levels and make sure that the master schedule has time set aside to give science instruction. 2. Look at the baseline data of students going into 5th grade and evaluate their strengths and weaknesses. 3. Prepare schedules for science lab and make sure that all students are involved in science at various levels 4. Incorporate science instruction in enrichment areas, with an emphasis on vocabulary
Person Responsible	Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.net)

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).

Other areas of focus are to increase parent involvement by holding curriculum nights for each grade level, invite parents to our PTO meetings and present curriculum information, invite parents into school through various activities throughout the year, and engage parents in our LIM initiative that will help to constitute a greater connection to our programs and policies, as well as, give them parenting tools to help develop leadership skills at home.
School safety meetings will be held each month with our threat assessment team to provide ongoing discussions to improve safety at our campus, and we will evaluate safety needs as they arise.
Teacher recruitment and professional development of new teachers will be based on need, but we will continue to maintain weekly meetings with new teachers to make sure they have what they need to be successful for their students academically and for them professionally.

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, § 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.

Our Leader in Me program has family components that we are using as an outreach for parent involvement. These are being incorporated throughout our parent activities this school year. We will continue to reach out to community members to participate in school activities and for support.

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.

COE kindergarten teachers hosted a Pre-K Night in the spring for parents and pre-school age students to come to school and participate in literacy activities and make activities to take home and continue working on throughout the year to help prepare for entering kindergarten. They were given materials to support home instruction. Teachers at the local RCMA Centers are invited to bring their students to Country Oaks Elementary School in the spring, and our Kindergarten teachers visit the local RCMAs to share expectations with parents and help to complete the appropriate paperwork to enroll students. During the visit the pre-school students are taken on a tour of the school. They visit the kindergarten classrooms and art, music, P.E., the library, where they see classroom routines. They also visit the playground and interact with the kindergarten students. In the lunchroom, they sit and enjoy a school lunch with their peers. Students are given a registration packet to take to their parents to complete and return to COE. Any questions the students or adults have are discussed.
COE now has 2 VPK classes, and 1 IPK class with 20 students in each class, to prepare for kindergarten. These students will participate in many COE events and also be introduced to kindergarten teachers and classes for special occasions. Fifth grade students visit the middle school in the spring, meet the teachers, visit various areas of the school and learn about the expectations in 6th grade. Students are encouraged to participate and ask questions. Fifth grade students travel to the middle school to get acquainted with the structure of the middle school.

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

All Title 1 funds work to supplement our current curriculum materials and academic goals. These funds will provide after school tutoring programs, ELL personnel for students, and professional development for teachers in all academic areas. After school program materials will be used to assist students in subgroups not meeting proficiency. The migrant afterschool program will be provided to migrant students to assist with homework and provide additional instruction in language acquisition. Title X Homeless funds are used to provide additional school materials for students identified as homeless and provide tutoring.
The DARE program is presented to 5th graders to support the prevention of the use of drugs, tobacco, and alcohol. Students work together and learn about the negative impacts they can make in your life.
The food services program also provides a free nutritious breakfast and lunch daily.

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.

We will have community Rotary Club partner with us to provide a spaghetti dinner for parents, and welcome them into the school for Open House. Local fast food restaurants partner with us to provide rewards for reading success and support fundraising for specific events.

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

We have a partnership with the local Rotary Club, and they support our family activities. Students that are able, will be working toward technology certifications that are typical for students in middle school aged students.