

Hendry County Schools

Eastside Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Eastside Elementary School

201 ARROYO AVE, Clewiston, FL 33440

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=11&sc_id=1171294169

Demographics

Principal: Denise Gibson

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2017

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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: C (45%) 2014-15: C (47%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Eastside Elementary School

201 ARROYO AVE, Clewiston, FL 33440

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=11&sc_id=1171294169

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">87%</p>

School Grades History

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

Eastside Elementary will lead by example to develop character and competence in every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Working together to turn today's learners into tomorrow leaders.

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
------	-------	---------------------------------

Sanchez, Sara	Principal	Sarah Sanchez, Principal sanchezs@hendry-schools.net Denise Gibson, Dean of Students gibsond@hendry-schools.net Melissa Gonzalez, Guidance Counselor gonzalezme@hendry-schools.net Ingrid Gutierrez, PreK gutierrezzi@hendry-schools.net Sherry Ireys, Kindergarten ireys@hendry-schools.net Ivette Porth, First Grade monzoni@hendry-schools.net Trisha Boykin, Second Grade reist@hendry-schools.net Nicole Balon, Third Grade balonn@hendry-schools.net Taylor Massey, Fourth Grade masseyt@hendry-schools.net Kristen Mann, Fifth Grade mannk@hendry-schools.net Tammy Mitchell, Enrichment Team mitchellt@hendry-schools.net Monica White, Intern whitem@hendry-schools.net
------------------	-----------	---

All members of the leadership team meet twice a month as a leadership team and once a week with their individual teams. They serve as instructional leaders for their specific groups and come together as a leadership team to make and share decisions regarding systems, structures, and academics for Eastside Elementary.

Gibson, Denise	Dean	
-------------------	------	--

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	102	88	95	101	115	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	608
Attendance below 90 percent	34	29	26	27	19	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	11	12	18	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	2	7	7	22	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

42

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/20/2019

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	39	37	37	45	39	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	12	16	22	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	29	37	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	4	2	6	16	18	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	39	37	37	45	39	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	12	16	22	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	29	37	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	4	2	6	16	18	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	45%	50%	57%	39%	44%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	54%	58%	42%	48%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	53%	36%	45%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	56%	63%	41%	48%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	62%	62%	43%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	45%	51%	35%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	44%	53%	38%	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	102 (0)	88 (0)	95 (0)	101 (0)	115 (0)	107 (0)	608 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	34 (39)	29 (37)	26 (37)	27 (45)	19 (39)	31 (27)	166 (224)
One or more suspensions	3 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	5 (2)	3 (1)	1 (1)	16 (4)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (8)	11 (12)	12 (16)	18 (22)	22 (22)	22 (18)	88 (98)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (29)	0 (37)	0 (20)	0 (86)

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%	47%	-4%	58%	-15%
	2018	53%	44%	9%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	48%	-2%	58%	-12%
	2018	42%	47%	-5%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	37%	47%	-10%	56%	-19%
	2018	49%	45%	4%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	52%	-1%	62%	-11%
	2018	60%	48%	12%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	57%	-2%	64%	-9%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	70%	53%	17%	60%	10%
	2018	67%	54%	13%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	41%	-1%	53%	-13%
	2018	52%	43%	9%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
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	26	18		32	41						

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
ELL	39	51	48	62	81	63	40				
BLK	39	50	53	54	63	53	41				
HSP	46	50	42	65	78	58	43				
WHT	50	40		65	76		36				
FRL	44	48	51	63	75	57	44				
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	38	50		35	43						
ELL	41	55	56	54	62	47	38				
BLK	37	50	43	43	52	45	36				
HSP	54	55	50	65	68	55	57				
WHT	57	63		68	81		56				
FRL	49	57	50	58	66	56	50				
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	6	32	25	13	27		20				
ELL	33	40	21	35	38	13	29				
BLK	27	31	33	27	40	48	5				
HSP	42	45	32	44	44	17	48				
WHT	50	50		58	46		70				
FRL	36	38	32	38	38	36	32				

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	56
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	57
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	50
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	57
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	53
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	56
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.

Our ELA data component is our lowest performing area of achievement. Our school district adopted a new ELA curriculum last year and our teachers and students were not fully acclimated to the curriculum and its materials. ELA achievement has been the lowest performing area as a trend for Eastside.

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

Our ELA data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Eastside scored 45% (2018-19) which showed a decline of 5% from the 2017-18 school year which scored at 50%. Our school district adopted a new ELA curriculum last year and our teachers and students were not fully acclimated to the curriculum and its materials.

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.

Our overall ELA achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Eastside scored 45% (2018-19) and the state average was 57%. Our school district adopted a new ELA curriculum last year and our teachers and students were not fully acclimated to the curriculum and its materials.

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

Our Math data component showed the most improvement from 60% (2017-18) to 62% (2018-19). We provided students in grades 3-5 after school math tutoring (Math Club) two days a week, and had over 90% participation from all three tested grade levels.

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 as per the EWS data from Part I (D), is the growth in the number from last year of students that demonstrate early warning indicators in grades 3-5.

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

1. Increase Reading Proficiency to 55% for 2019-20.
2. Continue improving high impact Best Practice strategies through professional development and standard-based planning.
3. Increase Science Proficiency using hands-on activities once a month in each grade level while using key vocabulary and terms.
4. Increase student connections between staff and students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase reading proficiency from 45% to 55% by May 2020.
Rationale	<p>Our reading proficiency decreased this year (2018-19) from 50% to 45% based on our school data. We will utilize research-based instructional strategies to implement standard based instruction in whole group and small group approaches.</p> <p>If standard based planing is implementation utilizing research- based instruction strategies, reading proficiency growth and proficiency will be demonstrated.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase reading proficiency from 45% to 55% by May 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sara Sanchez (sanchezs@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Our teachers and staff will collectively review best instructional strategies and determine which ones we will select to utilize and apply in the classroom. We will as an administrative team, conduct by grade level, monthly standards based planning sessions in which we will do a deep dive of the content that will be taught and how it will be taught and assessed. School administrators will monitor the use of these practices within the classrooms by conducting walk-through observations and monitoring weekly grade level data. All support staff will push into classrooms at least four times a week for focused reading group support using the LLI curriculum for one full hour.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Research states the importance of utilizing best practices for teaching and learning in the classroom. By guiding teachers through reviewing which ones are the best to apply in the classroom.,</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will implement best practice strategies that include student engagement in classroom instruction. 2. Teachers will plan standards based plans focused on breaking apart the standard and teaching the depth/rigor of the standard. 3. Teachers will plan/implement small group instruction based on data analysis that would indicate the students needs.
Person Responsible	Sara Sanchez (sanchezs@hendry-schools.net)

#2	
Title	Increase science proficiency from 43% to 55% by May 2020.
Rationale	Our science proficiency is below the state average by 10%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If science standards are implemented and measured for science proficiency, then science achievement will increase to 55% by May 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Denise Gibson (gibsond@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implement standards based planning for science and embrace a strong progress monitoring system that allows us to accurately gauge the level on student understanding from a formative perspective.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	It has long been argued that in order for effective instruction to take place, a teacher must use a strong planning approach that breaks down the standards students have to learn and fragments the learning. Our plan is to dive deeply into the context that must be assessed while giving students hands on experiments.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will participate in a hands on experiment once a month in grades K-5. 2. Professional development on science vocabulary and science specification will be implemented into PLCs 3. Science vocabulary and key terms will be implemented in all grades K-5. 4. Progress monitoring will be implemented and data will be analysed to measure proficiency of science standards.
Person Responsible	Denise Gibson (gibsond@hendry-schools.net)

#3	
Title	If our students are connected to other students and to the staff, our school culture will improve resulting in academic improvements.
Rationale	School culture is a powerful force in determining the probability of the success that our actions will lead to improvements. We want to promote an environment where students feel a sense of family and community. We want our student to be connected to our school and to each other. We want to see a positive school culture where the actions of both our students and our staff represent the best of our individual selves and our community.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	More than 80% of students will indicate on the end of the year student survey that they had a positive connections with other students and staff members. End of year parent survey will also indicate that 80% of our parents felt that their student had positive staff and student role models.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sara Sanchez (sanchezs@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will implement the House System from the Ron Clark Academy. We will implement culture building activities in our meetings with staff and students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence shows that schools that adopt the House System model from Ron Clark with fidelity, are able to improve academically due to an improved school culture where students felt they mattered and belonged. The paradoxical elements of connection and competition are necessary for building a great school where each student can grow to be the best version of themselves.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a house system that includes teams from every grade level. This will connect staff and students mentors. 2. Mentors will meet with lowest 25% of students 3 times a month. 3. Student data notebooks will be implemented. Student have ownership of data by creating action plans to determine next steps. 4. The Leader in Me program will be implemented teaching the Seven habits of effective people. This program prepares students to take on leadership roles by being held accountable for student data and creating action plans for improvement.
Person Responsible	Sara Sanchez (sanchezs@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).

School safety, teacher recruitment and development,

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.

Eastside has at least one family event per month that is either before or after work hours to connect with parents, families, and other stakeholders. These events span from data with donuts to a winter concert that supports our school mission and needs of students.

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.

- The Leader in Me: Seven Habits of Effective Kids. Each habit demonstrates a character that students need to be successful in life.
- Child Safety Courses are given in every class K-5
- DARE program; This program teaches students to respect each other and healthy choices in life
- Risk Assessment team. This team ensures that students that are at risk are identified and the proper services are given to each student.
- Big E, Little E program. All 5th grade students are paired with a Kindergarten student to conduct peer mentoring.
- Mentoring program. Each staff member is challenged to connect with one student, different every month to develop a positive relationship with that child.
- House System. Each classroom is paired with a team. In each team, students are match with a team (house) that represents their character trait. The house system adults mentors students within their house.

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

- The county offers a VPK Program with highly qualified teachers to students prior to entering Kindergarten.
- All three elementary schools, on our side of the district, come together at the end of each regular school year to host a Preschool visitation. All local preschools and parents are invited to attend the visitation prior to entering Kindergarten. The preschoolers receive a tour of the school, which includes activities in a Kindergarten classroom. There are centers for children and parents to visit, and a small assessment is given to show parents what can be worked on over the summer before the students enter Kindergarten.
- All fifth grade students have the opportunity to visit the middle school. During the visit, students are given a chance to register for classes, tour the campus, and meet the teachers.
- All students with special needs will have a transition meeting with the elementary IEP team and the middle school IEP team to ensure a smooth 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.

The school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources by reviewing the FSA, iReady, IEPS, 504s, and ELLS data to ensure that all students and grade levels are supported with the adequate personnel, instructions, and curricular.

Vanessa Rivero, ELL support para, ELL students instruction daily meeting

Ingrid Gutierrez, Resource Teacher, Focus of tier 3 and ELL students, meets daily with focus groups.

Margie Carter, para, student reading intervention with ESE, 504, tier 3 students

Terri Spears, para, student reading intervention with ESE, 504, tier 3 students

Jackie Hoopes, para, student reading intervention with ESE, 504, tier 3 students

Angie Carillo, para, student reading intervention with ESE, 504, tier 3 students

Marion Willis, para, student reading intervention with ESE, 504, tier 3 students

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

Eastside will be hosting a career day for 4th and 5th grade students that exposes the students to different careers in the community. Also each grade level is encouraged to invite a community member to share with grade level about their careers.