Browning Pearce Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Browning Pearce Elementary School

100 BEAR BLVD, San Mateo, FL 32187

www.putnamschools.org/o/bpes

Demographics

Principal: Yolanda Brady

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
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 (53%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: C (49%) 2014-15: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/5/2019.

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

Browning Pearce Elementary School

100 BEAR BLVD, San Mateo, FL 32187

www.putnamschools.org/o/bpes

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-6	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	44%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/5/2019.

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 Bear Mission Statement
Browning Pearce Elementary School will:

-Empower teachers to create a challenging learning environment where students are expected to excel in all academic standards, encouraged to think critically and persevere, and are inspired to be creative problem solvers.

-Foster positive relationships between staff, students, families, and the community we serve by welcoming those who wish to support our school and reaching out to those who may need our support.

-Maintain a safe learning environment where our students and their cultures are respected, and their unique abilities are valued.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Bear Vision Statement

At Browning Pearce, we are a unified family of learners who nurture & challenge each student to excel in the classroom & community.

The Bear Motto
EVERY CHILD. EVERY DAY.

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
Nelson, Beth	Principal	Conducts Business Between School and District Office School Improvement Plan Creates and Monitors Budgets Employee Evaluation Professional Development Attends Superintendent Advisory Council Meetings Attends City Council Meetings Hires and Manages Employees Leads Administration Team
Bellamy, Cindy	Assistant Principal	Discipline Coordinator PBIS Contact Safety Contact Public Relations Title 1 Audit Box Oversees Custodial Staff March of Dimes Contact
Jackson, Molly	Instructional Coach	K-2 i-Ready diagnostics and monitoring Coordinates Collaborative Classroom Program Monitors and Collects Data for K-2 PLC meetings Bus Discipline for K-2 School Advisory Council Chairperson Schedules K-2 interventions
Ramirez, Donna	Other	Community and Family Liason Caring Classroom Coordinator ESOL and WIDA 504 Plans ESE Contact Mental Health Contact Behavior Threat Assessment Coordinator Cumulative Folders and Student Records Parent Involvement Plan Terrific Kid Program
Bacon, Kan Dee	Instructional Media	Media Contact Technology Contact Science Contact Testing Coordinator Yearbook STEM Contact
Kite, Alyse	Administrative Support	Orders materials and supplies Monitors budgets Keeps personnel by position current Payroll

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Metzger, Cheryl	Attendance/Social Work	Monitors Attendance Data Attendance Rewards Truancy Meetings Inputs Skyward Data
Watson, Lashonda	Instructional Coach	3rd-5th grade i-Ready diagnostics and monitoring Monitor 3rd-5th grade PLC meetings Literacy Contact 3rd grade portfolio contact Keep lowest quartile lists current Safety Leaders 3rd-5th grade bus discipline Schedules interventions for 3rd-5th grade

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	100	97	75	106	94	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	13	31	24	30	23	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	31	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	1	0	4	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	4	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
38

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	26	33	34	42	37	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198
One or more suspensions	3	1	3	5	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	52	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	1	2	5	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	26	33	34	42	37	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198
One or more suspensions	3	1	3	5	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	52	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	1	2	5	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	41%	46%	57%	39%	43%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	55%	58%	50%	50%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	54%	53%	35%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	52%	51%	63%	49%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	56%	62%	47%	56%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	43%	51%	30%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	41%	53%	30%	37%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	100 (0)	97 (0)	75 (0)	106 (0)	94 (0)	110 (0)	0 (0)	582 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	13 (26)	31 (33)	24 (34)	30 (42)	23 (37)	33 (26)	0 (0)	154 (198)
One or more suspensions	0 (3)	1 (1)	0 (3)	3 (5)	8 (12)	13 (7)	0 (0)	25 (31)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (14)	0 (0)	12 (14)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (6)	31 (52)	46 (44)	0 (0)	83 (102)

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	44%	41%	3%	58%	-14%
	2018	36%	40%	-4%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	43%	-7%	58%	-22%
	2018	42%	38%	4%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	36%	42%	-6%	56%	-20%
	2018	32%	39%	-7%	55%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	46%	9%	62%	-7%
	2018	39%	48%	-9%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	53%	-8%	64%	-19%
	2018	55%	50%	5%	62%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	52%	44%	8%	60%	-8%
	2018	41%	48%	-7%	61%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	37%	38%	-1%	53%	-16%
	2018	29%	42%	-13%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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	25	57	68	32	49	48	38				
ELL	35	65		40	59		50				
BLK	23	46	47	37	54	47	13				
HSP	39	70	82	42	45		60				
MUL	64			64							
WHT	46	60	71	59	63	55	51				
FRL	38	57	67	49	58	49	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	30	36	28	30	48	52	23				
ELL	19	29		35	52		17				
BLK	22	31	22	35	42	35	11				
HSP	32	39		41	51	30	17				
MUL	53			47							
WHT	47	49	45	54	50	44	45				
FRL	37	41	33	44	47	38	28				

	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	17	17	14	25	28	25	11				
ELL	16	44		36	44						
BLK	24	48	35	39	39	14	13				
HSP	32	41			46	47	18				
MUL	45			46							
WHT	46	54	35	55	50	37	40				
FRL	35	50	37	45	44	26	31				

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	53
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	51
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	38
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	64
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	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
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 that showed the lowest performance was ELA reading proficiency. The percentage grew from 39% to 41% but is significantly below the state average of 57%. Systems are in place for improvement and the trend is that data is improving. Every grade level has an intervention block and every child is placed in a group according to what the data says they need.

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

The main seven components that make up the school grade all increased from the prior year. The data from the fourth graders who are now 5th graders showed a decline, ELA WAS 42% IN 2018 AND 36% in 2019. Math was 55% in 2018 and 45% in 2019. The team was made up of 6 teachers and 2 of the teachers were new to the team. There were changes to the curriculum, administration, and support services.

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 with the greatest gap is ELA proficiency.

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 quartile in ELA it grew from 34% to 67%. There were interventions such as SIPPS, ACT, and LLI put into place. Third grade had a scheduled intervention block and placed students in like groups for the various intervention programs. There was a school wide effort to create ELA standards focus boards.

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

Attendance is a concern
4th graders going to 5th grade had a high number of students scoring level 1

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. African American subgroup
3. Math proficiency
4. Attendance
5. Science proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Reading proficiency is the area of focus for our school as well as for our lowest performing subgroup (Black/African American Students)
Rationale	Our lowest school grade component was reading proficiency at 41%. The students in our Black/African American subgroup were at 23% reading proficiency.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The goal is to increase overall reading proficiency to 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Beth Nelson (bnelson@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	There will be a focus on creating strong reading structures using our Tier 1 reading resources and programs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	FSA scores and information from the needs assessment/analysis information on the CIMS site were resources that were used to determine that ELA proficiency should be an area of focus for Browning Pearce Elementary.

Action Step	
Description	1. Leadership team will support and monitor implementation of Center for Collaborative Classroom reading curriculum in grade K-2: Being a Reader, Being a Writer, and Making Meaning. The TSSA grant allows for 8 training days with a program specialist. 2. Leadership team will support and monitor implementation of the new ELA district pilot program in grades 3-5. One teacher from each grade level will participate in creating the curriculum units. 3. Every grade level has an intervention time on the master schedule and instructional coaches are aiding teachers in placing students in differentiated groups. 4. Teachers will participate in ongoing PLCs facilitated by our instructional coaches and the leadership team to engage in systematic data review sessions. 5. Utilize quality literacy programs: SIPPS, LLI, Smarty Ants, Imagine Learning, i-Ready, and AR. 6. Mrs. Bellamy, the assistant principal, is participating in a year long inquiry project focusing on improving the reading proficiency of our Black/African American subgroup. 66 students have been identified and will be carefully progress monitored, their EWS data will be tracked, and their independent reading progress will be encouraged. 7. Utilize TSSSA funds to hire a Student Success Mentor and Community and Family Liasion to support academic and social emotional needs of identified students.
Person Responsible	Beth Nelson (bnelson@my.putnamschools.org)

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 would like to move beyond parent contact and nurture true parental involvement. We will provide family oriented activities designed to create comfort with the school and school setting as well as academically oriented activities. We offer activities at various times so that parents have flexible times to attend. We will also add to our parent communication methods by keeping an updated digital bulletin in our front office, sending home monthly school newsletters, and conducting call out messages relaying pertinent information about important dates, events, and activities for BPES on a regular basis. In addition, we will maintain current social media outreach with families via our BPES Facebook page and post relevant school information and parent surveys on our BPES school website.

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.

Our inclusive guidance plan at Browning Pearce includes MTSS and Project Praise to address any additional student services needed. Small group counseling offered weekly and monthly addressing such issues as social skills, abuse, and/or grief. We address bullying through individual conferencing and classroom presentations and instruction. Red Ribbon Week will include anti-drug campaigning and informational presentations. The staff of BPES is trained in Behavioral Threat Awareness and the Behavioral Threat Assessment Team will conduct monthly meetings to discuss strategies to provide needed support to students who are referred for counseling and other services. Teachers utilize the curriculum Caring School Community to teach social and emotional skills.

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

District wide, all elementary schools invite Pre-K students to a Kindergarten Round-Up in the spring. This event is well advertised and well attended. Additional information is sent through Child Find so that parents of non school aged children can be better prepared and special needs can be identified and addressed prior to starting school. We also have a strong Pre-K program at each school. There is also outreach to the community VPK providers via invitations, trainings, and informational meetings at the district level. These initiatives are overseen by a district Pre-K Coordinator. The Pre-K Coordinator will ensure close articulation between Pre-K and Kindergarten. We invite representatives or administrators from Miller Middle School and CL Overturf to visit our 5th graders to share information and middle school options before they are taken on a campus visit and tour of the school they will likely attend. We also invite our PCSD assigned graduation coach to visit our campus to inform and educate our 5th grade students about the graduation plan, their opportunities for academic success, their accountability, and their progression status. Our rising 5th graders are encouraged to visit the 6th grade center and attend the summer orientation camp for CL Overturf 6th Grade Center- Camp Rise. Numerous students attend the camp each summer.

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-Based Leadership Team will meet weekly to review and discuss individual student intervention data. In order to comply with Federal Legislation (IDEA 2004) mandates as well as state regulations, a standard protocol process for research-based academic interventions and a diagnostic-prescriptive process for research based behavioral interventions will be utilized. MTSS is a Regular Education initiative whereby teachers are trained.

The U.S. Department of Education released proposed regulations to implement the requirements related to Federal spending in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as recently revised by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA} which states, Federal funds must supplement and may not supplant state and local funds. Regulations ensure that Federal funds are additive and do not take the place of state and local funds in low-income schools in keeping with the longstanding commitment under Title I that the nation's highest need students receive the additional financial resources necessary to help them succeed.

The District has a methodology for support not supplant when allocating State and local funds to each school.

The funding formula is based on Florida Public Schools Full-time Equivalent (FTE) data. Though the specific ratio may change year to year, this formula provides teachers for these grade levels at slightly below the ratio required to meet Florida's class size regulations.

Additionally, the school leadership team conducts a district unified Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) each school year. The CNA reports on how resources including personnel, instruction, and curriculum are aligned to identified needs. Student programming outcomes are monitored both in the CNA and district school data report-outs conducted quarterly.

Federal funding projects are monitored for auditing purposes by the Office of Federal Programs. Audit boxes for each program are maintained and aligned to pertinent work papers and Federal and State guidance.

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

Browning Pearce has partnered with local businesses who support our school's efforts to ensure quality educational experiences for all students. These business partners include Seminole Electric, Vulcan Materials Company, Best Western Inn of Palatka, and Putnam Well Drilling. These businesses have helped to fund classroom materials such as Florida Sunshine State Reader books for classroom libraries, funded educational field trips to local industrial plants, and provided much needed school supplies and student clothing or shoes as needed.

Other community support organizations that lend their service, time, and resources to BPES in support of our school mission are Victory Christian Fellowship Church, San Mateo Church of God, FL Dept. of Corrections, Haleigh's Closet, 91.3 WHIF HOPE FM radio ministry, Kelly's Hair Studio, and St. Johns River State College.