
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	0

Suncoast Elementary School

11135 QUALITY DR, Spring Hill, FL 34609

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

Demographics

Principal: Scott Piesik

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2019

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (44%) 2014-15: C (53%)
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	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Suncoast Elementary School

11135 QUALITY DR, Spring Hill, FL 34609

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>44%</p>

School Grades History

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

The staff of Suncoast Elementary will promote academic excellence through high expectations and academic rigor while encouraging the love of learning through the use of a differentiated instructional approach that recognizes the uniqueness of each student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the vision of Suncoast Elementary to create a community of academic excellence that will produce lifelong learners.

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
Piesik, Scott	Principal	The principal facilitates school based leadership meetings, shares district and school data with the team, and supports with the communication between the district and the staff.
Williams, Allison	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for collecting and presenting grade level data to the school leadership team. Shares information from administration with team and communicates team questions/needs to administration.
Troyer, Cecilia	Teacher, K-12	Assessment teacher assists with preparing school wide data to share with the school based leadership team. Provides support to teachers with testing.
Baker, Kelly	School Counselor	Relays information from administration to team and shares team questions/concerns with administration. Also shares information regarding PBS with leadership team.
Cameron, Kristen	Other	Shares information regarding MTSS/updates with leadership team.
Hray, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for collecting and presenting grade level data to the school leadership team. Shares information from administration with team and communicates team questions/needs to administration.
Hughes, Dacey	Assistant Principal	Assists with facilitating school based leadership team meetings and preparing data to be presented.
D'Anna, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for collecting and presenting grade level data to the school leadership team. Shares information from administration with team and communicates team questions/needs to administration.
Liebler, Shannon	Instructional Coach	Share any information regarding curriculum and district assessments with school based leadership team. Use data from SBLT meetings to prepare for PLCs and support teachers.
Sullivan, Diana	Teacher, PreK	Responsible for collecting and presenting grade level data to the school leadership team. Shares information from administration with team and communicates team questions/needs to administration.
Staton, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for collecting and presenting grade level data to the school leadership team. Shares information from administration with team and communicates team questions/needs to administration.
Holcomb, Stacey	Instructional Coach	Share any information regarding curriculum and district assessments with school based leadership team. Use data from SBLT meetings to prepare for PLCs and support teachers.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bennett, Philip	Other	Share discipline and attendance data with school based leadership team.
Howard, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for collecting and presenting grade level data to the school leadership team. Shares information from administration with team and communicates team questions/needs to administration.

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	132	133	164	170	152	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	892
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	5	6	8	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	6	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	34	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	8	6	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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 8/23/2019

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	22	19	14	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	9	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	14	9	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	20	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	7	7	4	6	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	22	19	14	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	9	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	14	9	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	20	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	7	7	4	6	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	52%	54%	57%	51%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	53%	58%	51%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	53%	57%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	54%	58%	63%	53%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	57%	62%	51%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	48%	51%	46%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	54%	53%	45%	54%	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	132 (0)	133 (0)	164 (0)	170 (0)	152 (0)	141 (0)	892 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (7)	0 (22)	0 (19)	0 (14)	0 (16)	0 (17)	0 (95)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	5 (5)	6 (3)	8 (9)	10 (8)	9 (7)	38 (32)
Course failure in ELA or Math	8 (13)	6 (14)	4 (9)	2 (3)	2 (5)	0 (5)	22 (49)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	21 (11)	34 (20)	39 (44)	94 (75)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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	49%	57%	-8%	58%	-9%
	2018	53%	62%	-9%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	59%	-8%	58%	-7%
	2018	39%	53%	-14%	56%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	51%	52%	-1%	56%	-5%
	2018	41%	53%	-12%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
	2018	61%	67%	-6%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	62%	-4%	64%	-6%
	2018	55%	60%	-5%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%
	2018	42%	56%	-14%	61%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	55%	-5%	53%	-3%
	2018	40%	56%	-16%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	18	40	33	29	44	36	17				
ELL	34	55	64	36	64	65	38				
ASN	82			73							
BLK	39	35		29	50		30				
HSP	50	56	58	55	58	50	47				
MUL	48	67		57	47						
WHT	54	53	46	56	57	50	53				
FRL	49	50	42	49	52	44	47				

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	14	26	35	29	29	29	31				
ELL	17	12		33	42						
ASN	77			69							
BLK	35	27		35	27						
HSP	42	25		54	43	25	48				
MUL	44	29		52	28						
WHT	45	35	33	57	40	38	35				
FRL	39	30	33	49	32	26	33				

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	24	44	52	30	48	56	28				
ELL	26	42		42	33						
BLK	29	42		38	58						
HSP	49	49	59	52	48	53	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
MUL	64	58		45	58						
WHT	52	52	55	55	51	44	48				
FRL	48	48	58	49	53	51	33				

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	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	446
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	55
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	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
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	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	55
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	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	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.

The lowest performance was our SWD subgroup. We had two long term subs in our ESE inclusion positions that serviced classes in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades. Our SWD population has been below the Federal Index for the last two years.

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

The greatest decline was in 3rd grade math. There was a lack of differentiated 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.

3rd and 5th grade math achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Again, there was a lack of differentiated instruction.

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

4th and 5th grade ELA had the most improvement. We were able to hire a Reading Coach who supported teachers and facilitated weekly lesson planning to ensure standard alignment.

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

Two areas of concern are attendance and the amount of level 1s on FSA.

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

1. Differentiated instruction
2. Data based decision making

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Creating a Culture of High Expectations
Rationale	School Grade data shows that 48% of our students in ELA and 46% of our students in Math are not proficient. The data also shows that 47% of our students in ELA and 43% of our students in Math are not making learning gains. According to the Federal Index percent our Black population is at 37% and our students with disabilities is 31%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The intended outcome is to increase the percent of student learning gains and percent proficient in all student success measures by 5%. The Federal Index percentage of our black population and our students with disabilities will increase to 41% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Differentiated Instruction - Data Driven Instructional Decision Making - High Impact Reading Strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Differentiated Instruction will allow teachers to meet the instructional needs of all students.</p> <p>Data Driven Decision Making will allow teachers to plan their instruction based on the areas of need.</p> <p>High Impact Reading Strategies will help increase the students' ability to comprehend complex text.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Designated time in the master schedule for common team planning to analyze data and develop differentiated instruction. 2. Low performing subgroups will be monitored in ELA and Math using i-Ready Diagnostic and formative assessment data. The data will be shared with teachers during PLCs. 3. Teachers will participate in weekly PLCs that will incorporate data driven decision making and will monitored by sign-in sheets and collected formative assessment data. 4. Provide professional development in using High Impact Reading Strategies that will be monitored by sign-in sheets and follow-up assignments. 5. Teachers will implement high impact reading strategies during instruction that will be monitored by lesson plans and administrative walkthroughs. 6. Designated time in the master schedule for differentiated instruction in reading and math. 7. Teachers will provide differentiated instruction in reading and math that will be monitored by lesson plans and administrative walkthroughs. 8. Developed outline of differentiated instruction criteria that will be shared with teachers through PLCs and monitored through lesson plans, walkthroughs, and a checklist of look-fors.
Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@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.

Suncoast Elementary builds a positive relationship with parents by hosting several family friendly events/workshops throughout the year, inviting all families and community members to SAC, Title I and PTO meetings, asking parents for input through direct participation and surveys. SES communicate with parents and the community in a variety of ways such as agenda, school marquee, notes/flyers send home via the backpack, and social media. SES collaborates with community business to provide resources for students, parents, and staff throughout the year. We all work together to maintain the high level of expectations and rigor that Suncoast Elementary holds for all students and staff.

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.

Suncoast Elementary has one Certified School Counselor who provides individual counseling, facilitates groups, and checks in daily with students. We also have one Teacher Resource who supports by mentoring students and building relationships.

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

For incoming Kindergarten students, Kindergarten Round Up is held in late spring for parents to acquire the necessary documentation to enter the school system. A Kindergarten Parent Night is held at the beginning of the new school year which includes a teacher led presentation welcoming the families and introducing them to Kindergarten expectations and procedures. Parents and students also spend time getting to know the Kindergarten teachers with curriculum information and schedules/routines.

We are fortunate to have options for our students moving on to Middle School. Our students who are zoned to attend Fox Chapel Middle School have the opportunity to visit the school at the end of fifth grade during a field trip. Students zoned for Powell Middle School have an opportunity to attend an informational evening session with their parents.

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.

Administration designs a school master schedule that allows for uninterrupted blocks of time for core instruction and daily specials (physical education, art, and media). Opportunities for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions are embedded into the daily schedule for targeted remedial and enrichment instruction based on student needs. Susan Rivera, Reading Resource Teacher, meets with students who are receiving Tier 3 interventions and/or have been retained to provide additional remediation. Kristen Cameron (Elementary Assistant) meets with grade level teams to examine and determine appropriate resources and strategies to be utilized for intervention.

MTSS meetings are available to teachers to work through the data-driven problem solving process when strategies and resources are not being successful during the Tier 2 support time. During MTSS meetings, the team examines all progress monitoring data collected, addresses the fidelity of the interventions delivered, and makes recommendations as to the next level of support. These meetings are scheduled weekly with teachers to develop a plan for targeted students. In addition, Kelly Baker (Certified School Counselor) and Kristen Cameron (Elementary Assistant) coordinate monthly PBS and MTSS leadership meetings with school grade level representatives and district support staff to continue to support the needs of the school.

I-Ready mathematics and reading are used in all grade levels to supplement core instruction and target students at their individual levels of learning. Student use the I-Ready program for 45 minutes per week per subject. Title I funds have helped purchase laptops to ensure students meet the minimum requirements of the program to maximize the students learning. In addition, Title I is funding an Instructional Practice coach to work with teachers, a reading resource teacher to work with students, and an additional ESE teacher. These decisions are based on school data. Resources are maintained in Alexandria by the Media Specialist.

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

N/A