

Hernando County School District

Explorer K 8



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	17
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Explorer K 8

10252 NORTHCLIFFE BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34608

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/ek8>

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Braithwaite

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hernando 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	17
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Explorer K 8

10252 NORTHCLIFFE BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34608

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/ek8>

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)
Combination School PK-8	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	47%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

All stakeholders in our community will work collaboratively to promote an environment of high expectations where all of our young explorers will have the opportunity to receive a quality, interactive education in a nurturing, safe and secure environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Explore today....Conquer tomorrow!

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
Braithwaite, Lisa	Principal	Oversees the implementation of the SIP with fidelity.
Fischer, Jocelyn	Teacher, K-12	Title I ELA Resource teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting of data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and deciding individual targeted instructional paths for students based on state and county (AP1, AP2, and AP3) data. Monitoring of students instructional paths for fidelity in accordance with state and district guidelines.
Weed, Donald	Administrative Support	Provides support for Principal with the implementation of the SIP with fidelity. Also monitors and implements the PBIS system.
MacGregor, Andrew	Assistant Principal	Provides support for Principal with the implementation of the SIP with fidelity.
Roman, Jillian	Administrative Support	Assessment teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting all grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and reporting state and county (AP1, AP2, and AP3) data for continuous monitoring of students achievement.
Dill, JB	Administrative Support	Title 1 Facilitator monitors the purchases made are tied to the areas of need based on the data. The coordination of family engagement activities and ensures that Federal Compliance is being meet.
Kling, Marguerite	Teacher, K-12	Title I Resource teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting of ELA and Reading data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and deciding individual targeted instructional paths for students based on state and county (AP1, AP2, and AP3) data. Monitoring of students instructional paths for fidelity in accordance with state and district guidelines.
Mentasti, Chris	Administrative Support	Resource teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting of MTSS data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and deciding individual targeted instructional paths for students based on state and county (AP1, AP2, and AP3) data. Monitoring of students instructional paths for fidelity in accordance with state and district guidelines.
Anderson, Erin	Teacher, K-12	Title1 Math Resource Teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for monitoring and guiding math instruction with an intense focus on grades 3 through 5. Also is in charge of the Mentoring Program for "New to Teaching Teachers" and "New to Deltona Teachers" to insure district and school wide procedures are followed.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Schwartz, Eric	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	166	194	150	206	157	180	205	203	191	0	0	0	0	1652
Attendance below 90 percent	20	15	11	18	15	22	24	21	26	0	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	12	5	18	7	14	33	50	37	48	0	0	0	0	224
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	4	0	19	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	32	42	70	70	44	0	0	0	0	275

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	47	25	46	47	56	92	120	95	116	0	0	0	0	644

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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)

125

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/24/2019

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	11	9	12	6	14	20	21	11	19	0	0	0	0	123	
One or more suspensions	4	12	12	23	51	100	134	144	114	0	0	0	0	594	
Course failure in ELA or Math	11	7	5	14	0	0	3	7	1	0	0	0	0	48	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	48	53	29	79	23	0	0	0	0	246	
	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	8	10	14	31	41	50	51	40	0	0	0	0	247	

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	11	9	12	6	14	20	21	11	19	0	0	0	0	123	
One or more suspensions	4	12	12	23	51	100	134	144	114	0	0	0	0	594	
Course failure in ELA or Math	11	7	5	14	0	0	3	7	1	0	0	0	0	48	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	48	53	29	79	23	0	0	0	0	246	
	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	8	10	14	31	41	50	51	40	0	0	0	0	247	

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	47%	70%	61%	48%	64%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	61%	59%	49%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	52%	54%	43%	48%	51%
Math Achievement	49%	70%	62%	55%	70%	58%
Math Learning Gains	49%	58%	59%	57%	63%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	58%	52%	59%	60%	50%
Science Achievement	49%	60%	56%	44%	59%	53%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	78%	83%	78%	63%	79%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	166 (0)	194 (0)	150 (0)	206 (0)	157 (0)	180 (0)	205 (0)	203 (0)	191 (0)	1652 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	20 (11)	15 (9)	11 (12)	18 (6)	15 (14)	22 (20)	24 (21)	21 (11)	26 (19)	172 (123)
One or more suspensions	12 (4)	5 (12)	18 (12)	7 (23)	14 (51)	33 (100)	50 (134)	37 (144)	48 (114)	224 (594)
Course failure in ELA or Math	13 (11)	4 (7)	0 (5)	19 (14)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (3)	2 (7)	0 (1)	41 (48)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	17 (14)	32 (48)	42 (53)	70 (29)	70 (79)	44 (23)	275 (246)

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	54%	57%	-3%	58%	-4%
	2018	69%	62%	7%	57%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	59%	-2%	58%	-1%
	2018	42%	53%	-11%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	37%	52%	-15%	56%	-19%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
06	2019	44%	52%	-8%	54%	-10%
	2018	48%	53%	-5%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
07	2019	50%	53%	-3%	52%	-2%
	2018	40%	51%	-11%	51%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	38%	53%	-15%	56%	-18%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	58%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	62%	-5%	62%	-5%
	2018	69%	67%	2%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	62%	-8%	64%	-10%
	2018	43%	60%	-17%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	60%	-15%
	2018	40%	56%	-16%	61%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	42%	53%	-11%	55%	-13%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	52%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
07	2019	61%	62%	-1%	54%	7%
	2018	56%	63%	-7%	54%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
08	2019	17%	50%	-33%	46%	-29%
	2018	60%	53%	7%	45%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-43%				
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	55%	-7%	53%	-5%
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	46%	54%	-8%	48%	-2%
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	50%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	86%	67%	19%	67%	19%
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	75%	1%	71%	5%
2018	67%	74%	-7%	71%	-4%
Compare		9%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	59%	13%	61%	11%
2018	88%	62%	26%	62%	26%
Compare		-16%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	45%	-45%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	18	40	38	23	44	42	14	60			
ELL	24	39	50	29	54	56	30	64			
ASN	67	54		73	62						
BLK	38	50	55	40	46	35	38	73			
HSP	41	50	44	41	48	49	41	74	48		
MUL	34	51	57	31	52	73	53	67			
WHT	53	52	52	56	50	53	55	81	41		
FRL	44	50	50	45	47	50	44	73	38		

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	16	31	26	27	50	48	37	19			
ELL	10	45	48	31	55	68	17				
ASN	67	70		73	60						
BLK	40	21	23	39	41	46	26	55			
HSP	43	42	36	49	50	61	43	62	59		
MUL	49	47		45	54	50	53	64			
WHT	51	45	38	59	52	53	56	73	32		
FRL	44	40	37	51	48	53	48	63	36		
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	9	40	42	14	46	50	18	24			
ELL	18	44	54	34	58	50	27				
ASN	60	38		73	69						
BLK	41	49	35	41	52	52	42	58			
HSP	39	45	42	51	59	57	30	62	29		
MUL	43	47	38	39	44	58	33				
WHT	53	51	47	60	57	61	51	65	47		
FRL	45	48	43	53	56	60	39	61	35		

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	54
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	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	542
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	47
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	64
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
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	52
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	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	55
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	52
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.

Explorer K-8's lowest performing data component was Middle School Math Acceleration, demonstrating 42% of applicable points earned. The contributing factors to last year's performance include targeted focus from resource teachers and district coach on Intensive Math courses instead of core classes and Algebra I.

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

Explorer K-8's greatest decline from the prior year was evidenced in Math Achievement, dropping from 54% to 49% of applicable points earned. The contributing factors include a targeted focus from resource teachers and district coach as they pushed in to Intensive Math courses instead of core classes. Intensive Math courses were using an i-Ready model for the first time, and additional training may have been needed to support ALL Math teachers in differentiating their instruction.

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.

Explorer K-8's greatest gap from the state average occurred in the 8th grade Math component, measuring 29% points less from the state average according to the raw data. The factors that contributed to this gap included a need for teacher training in differentiating instruction, and additional support from resource teachers and district coaches in pacing and rigor.

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

Explorer K-8's greatest improvement was shown in the area of ELA Bottom Quartile, earning 15% more points than the previous year, raising from 35% to 50% of points earned, and meeting our 2018-2019 School Improvement Plan Goal. Explorer K-8 implemented focused data chats regarding our school's ELA bottom quartile during PLC's and professional days. Title I resource teachers pushed in to classrooms to provide focused assistance during differentiated instruction, and bottom quartile student groups were formed, meeting with resource teachers for additional instruction throughout the day.

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

The number of students earning a Level 1's on the FSA in 7th and Eighth Grade is 140.
The number of students receiving one or more suspensions in the 7th Grade was 144. These are now our eighth grade students.

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

1. Bottom Quartile in Math and Reading
2. Students with Disabilities
3. ELL in Middle School

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Student-Centered Decision Making
Rationale	Math Achievement dropped from 54% students proficient to 49% from 2017-2018. Additionally, Explorer's learning gains in Math decreased from 51% showing growth to 49%. Finally, the students in the lowest 25% in Math dropped from 54% showing growth, to 50%. ESSA Federal Index was 35%, missing the target of 41%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Explorer K-8 plans to increase the percentage of students demonstrating learning gains in Math by at least 5 percentage points in the year 2019-2020. The number of SWD scoring proficient will increase from 35% to 41% as indicated by the ESSA Federal Index.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Explorer K-8 will make student centered decisions by supporting the BQ in grades 4-8 with alternative instructional strategies, additional resource teachers, developing strategic push in and pull out schedules, and collaboration among teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Explorer K-8 experienced success through a combined effort resulting in a 15% increase in students making learning gains through student centered decisions in ELA for 2018-2019 by supporting the BQ in grades 4-8 with alternative instructional strategies, additional resource teachers, developing strategic push in and pull out schedules, and collaboration among teachers.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase the number of Math Resource Personnel 2. Determine the students who need remediation and/or targeted instruction 3. Access the data (FSA, i-Ready) to look for trends within strands using the I Notice, I Wonder Protocol 4. Develop push in and pull out schedules to meet the needs of students who have not made learning gains and are in the lowest 25% 5. Strategically place students in Intensive Math Courses who earned a Level 1 6. Systematically monitor student outcomes by analyzing i-Ready data. 7. Seek and provide opportunities for training teachers. 8. Discuss and formulate a plan of action using the Data Reflection Journal Template, administrative walkthroughs and Resource Teacher Observations. The Middle School Math Coach will be asked to work with core classes.
Person Responsible	Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite_l@hcsb.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).

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.

From the beginning of school we begin to develop positive relationships and open communication between parents and teachers. School communication folders and agendas are used daily to communicate academic and behavioral progress daily. Parents are invited to participate in monthly Title 1 Parent/SAC Meetings. Parents and local community partners participate in various Family Nights and school activities throughout the year. Community stake holders such as Operation HEARTfelt and People Helping People provide weekend food services to our students as well. The Title 1 compact encourages and sets expectations between students, parents, and teachers. Explorer K-8 establishes partnerships with businesses including our neighboring McDonalds, Winn Dixie, YMCA, as well as People Helping People and Operation Heartfelt weekend food backpack programs. Explorer Students interact with the community through Beta Club, student council, and various community volunteer projects.

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.

Social-emotional needs of the students are being met by providing counseling, mentoring, and social services by the school guidance counselor and social workers . Elementary students are taught social-emotional skills by the school's social workers in the classrooms. All students in Tier 1 are part of the school wide PBIS program. Tier 2 students focus on social skills daily by using the Check In/Check Out mentoring process. Tier 3 students are provided counseling by the Guidance Counselor. The counselor and social workers are part of the Threat Assessment Team.

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

Pre-Kindergarten to Kindergarten: Explorer K-8 holds a "Kindergarten Open House" event the week before school starts in which parents are invited by the Administration to learn about procedures of the school, as well registering their child(ren) for Kindergarten. Parents will also be able to meet the kindergarten teachers, join the SAC, and find out about the Title I program.

Elementary to Middle School: Fourth and Fifth grade students are able to join a chorus club to begin developing skills that they will use when enrolled in the electives the next school year. Guidance visits the 5th grade classrooms to talk about the upcoming choices available to students as they enter middle school.

Middle to High School: Middle School students attend High School orientation sessions and invite High School guidance counselors to host question and answer sessions for current 8th graders.

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 SIP development team surveys the staff, analyze student performance, discipline, and attendance data, and then develop the goals, barriers, strategies and evaluation processes and tools aimed at improving student performance at EK8. Professional Learning Communities meet weekly to examine performance data. The MTSS problem solving process is applied to the new data; data is analyzed, problem areas identified, interventions developed, and tracking methods established, then trainings and interventions are applied which are all designed to meet the SIP goals. The MTSS team determines school-based, grade level, and subject-level needs. In addition, the team ensures students are receiving appropriate Tier 1, 2 and 3 services/interventions with fidelity.

The Title I Facilitator (TIF) collaborates with the District's Coordinator of Family Involvement to build home support networks that will facilitate targeted student success. The TIF will coordinate with the SBLT to provide tutoring for students based on the previous school year data. The services at EK8 will be coordinated with other federally-funded programs, including use of Title II funds to support additional research-based professional development programs and teacher recruitment and retention activities, use of Title III funds to support additional services for our English Language Learners (ELLs), use of Title IX funds to provide additional services for our homeless students, and use of IDEA funds to support additional supplemental services for our disabled students (SWDs). Title I funds are used to provide a specialized social worker who serves as the district's homeless liaison and who coordinates exemplary local public school homeless education programs and services.

EK8 implements PLC's to discuss changes in instruction, strategies, and/or school improvement activities. Teachers disaggregate the student data for core curriculum using the Student Work Analysis Protocol (SWAP).

All Title I inventory is monitored by the Title I facilitator through the use of Alexandria.

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

My Career Shines is used in grades 6-8 to promote college and career awareness. Accelerated coursework and CTE courses that culminate in an industry certification are offered at Explorer. Students also participate in the District College and Career Night.