Titusville High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Titusville High School

150 TERRIER TRL S, Titusville, FL 32780

http://www.titusville.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Gonzalez L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	55%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (71%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Brevard 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

Titusville High School

150 TERRIER TRL S, Titusville, FL 32780

http://www.titusville.brevard.k12.fl.us

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)
High School PK, 9-12	No	47%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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.

Titusville High School fosters the academic passion ("I Want It"), purpose ("I Know Why I Want It"), and perseverance ("I Will Work to Get It!") that students need to be successful in the college or career of their choosing.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Titusville High School will foster a high performing learning culture in which students, staff, and community members promote academic excellence, creativity, empathy, equity, and the pursuit of excellence.

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
Gonzalez, Jennifer	Principal	
Burgess, Barbara	Assistant Principal	
Marovich, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	
Hamed, David	Dean	
Rassman, Todd	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	335	338	339	295	1307
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	25	27	30	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	41	33	25	145
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	61	39	18	156
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	76	34	16	192

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	19	22	20	7	68

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	7	5	10	11	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	9	11	30

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
76

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/30/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	30	40	32	140
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	42	31	17	144
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	95	66	35	313
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	79	34	16	224

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	

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	58%	59%	56%	58%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	52%	51%	49%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	40%	42%	40%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	43%	48%	51%	52%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	49%	49%	48%	46%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	45%	45%	33%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	62%	66%	68%	74%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	70%	73%	72%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	335 (0)	338 (0)	339 (0)	295 (0)	1307 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	44 ()	25 ()	27 ()	30 ()	126 (0)
One or more suspensions	46 (0)	41 (0)	33 (0)	25 (0)	145 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	38 (0)	61 (0)	39 (0)	18 (0)	156 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	66 (0)	76 (0)	34 (0)	16 (0)	192 (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
09	2019	56%	62%	-6%	55%	1%
	2018	58%	60%	-2%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	59%	59%	0%	53%	6%
	2018	57%	61%	-4%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	66%	0%	67%	-1%
2018	76%	67%	9%	65%	11%
Compare		-10%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	71%	14%	70%	15%
2018	78%	70%	8%	68%	10%
Compare		7%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	31%	61%	-30%	61%	-30%
2018	31%	62%	-31%	62%	-31%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	46%	60%	-14%	57%	-11%
2018	52%	60%	-8%	56%	-4%
Compare		-6%			

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	23	33	30	15	33	25	27	36		70	29
ELL	7	13	8	27	33		20				
ASN	72	46		82	50		82	82			
BLK	40	39	34	23	40	35	32	63		85	53

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
HSP	43	34	9	39	51	40	58	78		82	74
MUL	52	38	10	39	45		72	82		78	71
WHT	65	53	42	50	51	49	71	88		88	81
FRL	44	40	33	34	43	39	48	73		81	66

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	22	32	25	16	36	26	61	52		60	60
ASN	74	59		75	64		100	73			
BLK	37	42	41	26	36	27	52	63		73	60
HSP	55	45	28	35	34	21	79	80		75	83
MUL	58	36		39	39		79	76		81	86
WHT	65	50	47	55	52	49	85	84		87	79
FRL	47	42	42	39	44	37	71	72		72	61

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	4	35	37	13	23	25	38	28		74	29
ASN	72	70		71	72		65			100	91
BLK	30	37	35	22	27	23	42	50		81	43
HSP	49	45	42	41	39	32	66	61		90	63
MUL	56	48	43	50	49	46	83	64		100	74
WHT	68	53	42	63	52	39	84	82		90	71
FRL	45	43	37	45	43	33	69	65		86	55

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	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	620
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	21
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	69
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	44
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	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	54
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	64
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	50
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.

1. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile - new staff; lack of rigor in ILA classes; lack of student motivation
2. ALG EOC - this is a continued trend for THS; inconsistent standards-based instruction; new staff
3. SWD - high ESE suspension rate (both OSS and ISS); block scheduling reduces amount of time outside of ESE classrooms (BPIE data); lack of supportive ESE strategies in inclusionary classrooms
4. ELL - lack of specific ESOL strategies being implemented in the classroom

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

1. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile (-10 points) - decreases in all subgroups with notable declines in:
a. Hispanic (-20 points). See above for factors that contributed to decline.
b. FRL (-9 points)
2. SWD Science and Social Studies (-34 points, -16 points). Lack of support in inclusionary classrooms.
3. Black Science Achievement (-20 points). Inconsistent standards-based instruction; limited implementation of resources.
4. FRL Science (-23 points). Ineffective teaching which did not utilize resources to create appropriate standards-based instruction.
5. Biology EOC (-10 points). Inconsistent standards-based instruction; limited implementation of resources.

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.

1. ALG EOC (-30 points) - inconsistent implementation of standards-based instruction; inexperienced teachers
2. Geometry EOC (-11 points) - alignment of classroom activities with priority standards on the EOC
3. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile (-10 points) - lack of student motivation; inconsistent implementation of standards-based instruction
4. Math Achievement (-8 points) - standards-based instruction occurring inconsistently

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

1. Black Graduation Rate (73% to 85%) - mentoring programs, check-ins, data corrections, literacy coach developing strategies to increase black graduation rate; remediation program implemented during homerooms
2. Black Math Lowest 25th Percentile (+8 points) - no special actions taken
3. Hispanic Math Learning Gain (+17 points) - no special actions taken
4. Hispanic Math Lowest 25th Percentile (+19 points) - no special actions taken

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

1. Attendance - Nearly 10% of students have 90% or less attendance rate.
2. Students with two or more EWS indicators, especially including ESE, Minority, and/or FRL.

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

1. Increase math achievement rates.
2. Increase ELA Learning Gains and lowest 25th Percentile rates.
3. Improve SWD and ELL subgroup progress in all areas.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase math achievement rates.
Rationale	THS' ALG EOC scores have stagnated the past two years at approximately 30% below the district and state averages. Algebra teachers must continue to acquire the necessary skills needed to provide successful instruction and enhance standards-based instruction which correctly aligns to outcome measures. THS has experienced teacher turnover in the past several years. Currently our algebra teachers each have less than two years of experience. The THS Geometry scores declined 6% percentage points last year and are 14% below district average and 11% points below the state average.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 2020 school year: 1. The Algebra EOC pass rate will increase from 31% to 40%. 2. The Geometry EOC pass rate will increase 46% to 53%. 3. The SWD Achievement rate will increase from 15% to 25%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Barbara Burgess (burgess.barbara@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher collaboration and professional development which will enhance instructor skills in designing and implementing standards-based instruction to both majority and minority demographic groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our teachers must continue to acquire the necessary skills needed to provide successful instruction and enhance standards-based instruction which correctly aligns to outcome measures. Teacher collaboration, professional development, and CMA groups will help build collective teacher efficacy, enhance instruction, and benefit all math students.

Action Step	
Description	1. Algebra I teachers will participate in the North Area Math Cohort, which will meet periodically to discuss instructional strategies, best practices, and standards-based instruction. 2. The district Math Resource teacher will provide observation and feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices and curriculum planning around priority testing standards. 3. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walk-throughs and provide informal feedback regarding classroom practices. 4. CMA teacher groups will meet monthly to collaborate and work on math content specific strategies, formative, and common assessments for their specific courses. 5. ESE teachers will be active participants in Math CMA groups and department meetings when possible. 6. Math teachers will meet quarterly to analyze individual student data from MAP NWEA progress monitoring to ensure students are meeting testing standards and to self-assess progress towards instructional standards.

7. Math teachers will participate in professional development opportunities for high yield instructional practices. Administration will provide opportunities for teachers with 2 or less years of experience to observe peers who are highly effective mathematics instructors.

8. Teachers will identify SWDs and ELL students, collaborate with ESE case managers/ teachers about effective ESE/ELL strategies, and document ESE/ELL strategies with fidelity. These practices will ensure awareness of students' specific academic needs and promote more effective lesson-planning and instruction.

9. During the first semester, the district ESE Resource Teacher will provide professional development regarding effective SWD learning strategies.

10. ESE teachers and instructional assistants will push-in into our ALG classes to give targeted assistance to students in need.

Person Responsible Todd Rassman (rassman.todd@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	Based upon broad data components, ELA Learning Gains remained the same and overall ELA achievement decreased by 1%. However, THS students showed the least amount of progress compared to 2018 in ELA Lowest 25th Percentile, as evidence by a reduction of 10% from 2018 to 2019.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2020 school year, the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile will demonstrate a 10% increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Barbara Burgess (burgess.barbara@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher collaboration and professional development
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our teachers must continue to acquire the necessary skills needed to provide successful instruction and enhance standards-based instruction which correctly aligns to outcome measures. Teacher collaboration, professional development, and CMA groups will help build collective teacher efficacy, enhance instruction, and benefit all math students.

Action Step

Description	1. New ILA teachers will participate in Reading Plus training.
	2. Teachers in all subject areas will identify their students who are in the Lowest 25th Percentile. They will use this information to design and implement high-yield strategies which will assist these students in reading and comprehending content. These strategies might include: setting high expectations, front-loading vocabulary, scaffolding, differentiation by content, process, or product, concept-mapping, etc.
	3. Teachers in all subject areas will identify SWD students, collaborate with ESE case managers/teachers about comprehensive intervention strategies, and document ESE strategies with fidelity. These practices will ensure awareness of students' specific academic needs and promote more effective lesson-planning and instruction. During the first semester, the district ESE Resource Teacher will provide professional development regarding effective SWD learning strategies, such as using digitals, word maps, differentiation, etc.
	4. ESE teachers and instructional assistants will push-in into English and science classes to provide targeted assistance to SWD.
	5. Teachers in all subject areas will identify their ELL students. The ESOL Resource Teacher will provide one training each semester to teachers regarding how to implement effective ELL strategies. THS will make every effort to ensure ELL students participating in ILA/ELA courses are assigned to an ESOL-certified instructor.

6. Students in the Lowest 25th Percentile who are also SWD, minority, and FRL will be referred to the THS mentoring program for an extra layer of support.

7.. Implement MTSS and SRI for non-SWD as identified through ILA classes.

8. The literacy coach will assist teachers in all subject areas with comprehensive interventions for struggling students, conduct small-group pull-out, conduct data chats and goal-setting in ILA classes, and FSA practice.

9. Administrators will provide feedback to teachers based upon observations during walk-throughs and informal observations regarding curriculum planning and instructional practices.

10. Teachers will collaborate during common planning time about methods to inspire, motivate, and celebrate the successes of the Lowest 25th Percentile.

Person Responsible   Jamie Marovich (marovich.jamie@brevardschools.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).

N/A

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase math achievement rates.	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**