

Bay District Schools

Hutchison Beach 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	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Hutchison Beach Elementary School

12900 MIDDLE BEACH RD, Panama City, FL 32407

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Glenda Nouskhajian

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	63%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (47%) 2014-15: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Hutchison Beach Elementary School

12900 MIDDLE BEACH RD, Panama City, FL 32407

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	91%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We are dedicated to developing lifelong leaders. We strive to improve the quality of student performance within a safe environment. We facilitate students as they develop educational and personal goals. Our students are emerging leaders who will meet the challenges of a global society.

We believe and follow our "SPLASH" Pledge. Beach Dolphins are SAFE, POLITE, LEADERS, ACHIEVING, SUCCESS at HBES. Go Dolphins!!!!

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are a community of leaders leaving a legacy! Our Instructional vision is for all students to be highly engaged in grade level assignments that are taught to the rigor of the standards in a risk free, collaborative and culturally responsive learning environment.

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
Nouskhajian, Glenda	Principal	
Adkins, Chasity	Teacher, K-12	
Folsom, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Cox, Sharen	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Chair
Thompson, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Administrator
Roe, Jerry	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Chair
Quinn, Mark	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Chair
Robinson, Kayla	Instructional Media	Leadership Team
Palmasani, Anne	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Chair
Turner, Natasha	School Counselor	
Webb, Shelly	Teacher, ESE	

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	104	111	103	117	96	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	627
Attendance below 90 percent	25	33	21	20	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	13	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	1	3	4	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	12	7	1	13	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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

41

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/22/2019

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	37	41	29	22	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	4	4	10	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	12	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	24	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

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	1	6	8	9	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	37	41	29	22	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	4	4	10	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	12	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	24	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

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	1	6	8	9	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	61%	55%	57%	60%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	59%	58%	60%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	57%	53%	64%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	60%	56%	63%	61%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	54%	62%	58%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	42%	51%	42%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	61%	53%	53%	66%	44%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	104 (0)	111 (0)	103 (0)	117 (0)	96 (0)	96 (0)	627 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	25 (37)	33 (41)	21 (29)	20 (22)	11 (26)	21 (24)	131 (179)
One or more suspensions	1 (4)	4 (4)	3 (10)	5 (4)	1 (5)	4 (7)	18 (34)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	4 (5)	2 (12)	3 (1)	1 (3)	1 (0)	11 (21)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (21)	13 (24)	33 (31)	60 (76)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	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	53%	61%	-8%	58%	-5%
	2018	61%	57%	4%	57%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	58%	-6%	58%	-6%
	2018	57%	51%	6%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	62%	56%	6%	56%	6%
	2018	54%	50%	4%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	62%	1%	62%	1%
	2018	65%	63%	2%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	59%	-9%	64%	-14%
	2018	52%	59%	-7%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
	2018	58%	57%	1%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	54%	7%	53%	8%
	2018	54%	54%	0%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
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	24	55	58	36	45	47	31				
ELL	42	58	75	49	58	53	31				
HSP	40	50	65	45	50	42	31				
MUL	65			71							
WHT	65	74	76	64	47	47	63				
FRL	50	56	48	58	52	56	57				
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	29	34	31	37	29	25	24				
ELL	45	62	62	42	24	18					
BLK	58			50							
HSP	44	55	54	42	28	8	46				
MUL	57	50		54	55						
WHT	63	57	50	68	48	28	61				
FRL	57	57	56	60	43	26	51				
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	35	55	56	34	41	29	24				
ELL	31	67	67	31	44	43					
BLK				40							
HSP	36	62		42	54	50	36				
MUL	86			71							
WHT	65	62	64	66	60	35	72				
FRL	55	61	67	51	51	44	60				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	486
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	68
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	62
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	58
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 data component which showed the lowest performance was the lowest 25% of mathematics gains. Even though we increased from 26% to 41%, our scores are still below the district and state percentages. Due to Hurricane Michael, we had an influx of new students and staff which contributed to a lack of fidelity and a shorter school year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was math achievement. The growth percentile decreased from 57th to 37th percentile. The performance percentile decreased from 51st percentile to 45th percentile. Due to Hurricane Michael, we had an influx of new students and staff which contributed to a lack of fidelity and a shorter school year.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was in math learning gains. The state average was 62% and our school average was 49%. Due to Hurricane Michael, we had an influx of new students and staff which contributed to a lack of fidelity and a shorter school year.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the lowest 25% in ELA. Our scores in this area were above the district and state percentiles. We went from 51% to 66% During PLCs we focused on the rigor of instruction in ELA.

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. We had 179 students who fell under the indicator of attendance below 90%.

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

1. Mathematics learning gains of the lowest 25%
2. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Mathematics-Learning Gains
Rationale	Our percentile in math learning gains was significantly below our district's and the state's percentiles.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The intended outcome is to increase our lowest 25% in Math FSA from 41% to 55% as well as to increase learning gains of all students from 49% to 61%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michelle Thompson (thomprm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>We will use MAP data, as well as Eureka Math common assessments, to identify students that are in this group and establish a data baseline. We will have weekly data meetings with teachers and administration as well as monthly data meetings with teachers, counselors and administration to discuss each student and make instructional adjustments. To ensure that instruction is standards based, the BDS walkthrough tool will be used for progress monitoring.</p> <p>Research shows that frequent data analysis combined with adjusted instruction increases student achievement. "In order to raise student achievement, schools must use diagnostic assessments to measure students' knowledge and skills at the beginning of each curriculum unit, on the spot assessments to check for understanding during instruction, and end of unit assessments and interim assessments to see how well students learned. All of these enable teachers to make mid-course corrections and to get students into intervention earlier." (Odden 2009 p. 23) To truly impact learning gains, students have to be exposed to on-grade material and given the skills and strategies to grapple with that on-grade level material.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify students that are in this targeted group by using baseline data points from FSA, as well as the fall MAP assessment. 2. PLC teams will meet weekly to discuss these students, look for trends in the data, and make adjustments as needed to ensure success. 3. We will conduct monthly Instructional Leadership Team meetings to analyze data and vertical alignment to ensure all members of our staff are aware of all of our students and their progress toward the goal. 4. Students will use their personal MAP and Eureka Math Assessments data to create academic goals for improvement.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	The number of students falling below 90% attendance rose from 179 students in 2017-18 to 190 students in 2018-19.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The intended outcome for this focus is to decrease the number of students below 90% from 190 students to 171 students. This will result in a decrease of 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Natasha Turner (turnenl@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	To increase attendance and elevate excessive tardies, we have provided board games for students and teachers to build relationships before the school starts. As well as dedicated times built in the master schedule for morning meetings. We will analyze EWS data from Focus during monthly MTSS meetings to determine the correlation between students on the EWS report who are also Tiered in the MTSS process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Epstein and Sheldon (2002) note in order to manage chronic attendance problems, schools need to "intensify interpersonal relationships between students and teacher" (p. 309).
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To increase attendance teachers open their doors for Morning Choice from 7:15-7:35. During this time students play board games with each other to build trusting relationships. 2. Built in the master schedule is a dedicated morning meeting time for teachers and students to build positive and trusting relationships. 3. At ten a.m. on Fridays, the students who have perfect attendance stand up and dance for 30 seconds.
Person Responsible	Glenda Nouskhajian (nouskgt@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

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.

We plan on building relationships with all stakeholders by hosting parent events, both in the AM and PM, having open lines of communication, and creating a welcoming procedure for all incoming parents and students. The SIP was developed with the involvement of parents and other community members. Please see the attached Title I Parent and Family Engagement Plan.

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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.

Our school has two full-time Guidance Counselors who work with teachers, parents, and students to attend to the social, emotional, and academic welfare of all children. These counselors routinely meet with small groups and individual students to provide students with strategies to deal with challenging situations. Our parent liaison will also oversee the Watch DOG program, which enlists male parents to act as mentors to our students. Our school also partners with Elevate Bay that includes businesses and organizations in the community to provide adult mentors for students. The mentoring programs are overseen by the guidance department and mentoring sessions occur regularly throughout the year. We have a Military Family Life Counselor who also works with military related personnel and their dependents. This year we have access to Mental Health professionals through a State sponsored program. Our Telehealth Counselor and PROMISE para also help ensure the social-emotional needs of all students.

- Tier 2 Interventions: Social Skills Group, Zoo-U, Check-In/Check-Out, Mentoring, etc.
- Tier 3 Interventions: Individualized Functional Behavioral Assessments & Positive Behavioral Intervention Plans

We ensure that the social-emotional needs of students are met by implementing positive behavior supports school-wide. In addition, the Leader in Me program provides each student with a framework to identify personal strengths and weaknesses and the skills to set goals and employ strategies to meet those goals.

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

All incoming Kindergarten students at Beach Elementary School are assessed using the FLKRS/ECHOS and MAP Assessments. This data will be used to plan daily academic instruction for all students and for groups of students or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Transition activities begin with Pre-K students interacting with Kindergarten students throughout the year as appropriate. These activities may include visits of Pre-K students to the K classroom, parental activities, and orientation.

In addition visits for 5th grade to the feeder middle school are provided to aware the students of the next step in their academic career.

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 MTSS team will meet to build consensus and make decisions about implementation. The MTSS team functions to conduct on-going MAP, FSA / FCAT Science data, and other Universal Screening data to match interventions to student needs and stakeholder accountability. We will review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting or exceeding benchmarks and students who are at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the MTSS team will identify and ensure professional development. The MTSS team is responsible for school-wide implementation. The MTSS team provides training and coaching to school staff. School administrators will use individual student performance data to determine activities and the MTSS structures needed to meet the needs of their students. The MTSS process will be integrated in the District Reading Plan, District Student Progression Plan, and School Improvement Plan.

Administration and instructional staff are made aware of available resources from various funding sources during District meetings throughout the school year.

The needs of students and their families are addressed during parent conferences and other meetings.

Title I, Part A funds are coordinated with federal, state, and local funds and services to provide high quality supplemental instruction and support services for educationally disadvantaged students at schools with 63% or more students qualifying for the Free/Reduced Lunch Program. The purpose of Title I funding is to implement programs and services that ensure that all children have a fair, equal and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging state academic achievement standards and state academic assessments. Title I, Part A funds and various other funds are coordinated and integrated to provide services for private schools, local neglected and delinquent institutions, and Homeless Programs.

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

Mentors from local businesses and the area military bases partner with struggling students to provide them with academic support. These mentors share information about college and career readiness based on their profession.

Community business partners are invited to participate in SAC.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Mathematics-Learning Gains	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00