

Brevard Public Schools

# Delaura Middle School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Delaura Middle School

300 JACKSON AVE, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

<http://www.delaura.brevard.k12.fl.us>

## Demographics

**Principal: Tina Susin M**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (68%) 2014-15: A (79%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Delaura Middle School

300 JACKSON AVE, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

<http://www.delaura.brevard.k12.fl.us>

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 7-8	No	22%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	A	A	A	A

## 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.**

To provide a positive school environment where students may develop their individual skills and talents and prepare for their future endeavors in high school and beyond. Our school culture will foster security, responsibility, respect, and achievement for all.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To provide a quality education in a friendly and supportive atmosphere.

### 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
Lebrun, Jeremy	Principal	Oversee all curriculum, facilities, security and school related operations for DeLaura Middle School. Primary instructional leader of the building focused on faculty Professional development, student achievement and community building.
Barna, Laura	Assistant Principal	Oversee all aspects of curriculum, instructional resources, FTE, academic departments and student scheduling. Provide faculty with professional development and connect district resources teachers to our school.
Evans, Amy	Dean	Primarily responsible for student discipline process, facility operations, business partners and student activities. Other areas of focus include MTSS coordinator, business partner liaison, facilities responsibilities, security/drill management, FOCUS school leader and student recognition activities.

### 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	441	402	0	0	0	0	843
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	31	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	8	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	39	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	29	0	0	0	0	65

**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	116	127	0	0	0	0	243
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	-----

**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	1	0	0	0	1
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	5
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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

53

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 9/17/2019

**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	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	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	80%	59%	54%	76%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	56%	54%	68%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	48%	47%	67%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	91%	66%	58%	86%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	69%	55%	57%	67%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	73%	45%	51%	66%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	69%	52%	51%	74%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	75%	72%	89%	76%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)		Total
	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	441 (0)	402 (0)	843 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	83 ( )	31 ( )	114 (0)
One or more suspensions	12 (0)	8 (0)	20 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	25 (0)	39 (0)	64 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	36 (0)	29 (0)	65 (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
07	2019	77%	58%	19%	52%	25%
	2018	72%	56%	16%	51%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	80%	63%	17%	56%	24%
	2018	83%	65%	18%	58%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	87%	62%	25%	54%	33%
	2018	83%	62%	21%	54%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	82%	43%	39%	46%	36%
	2018	75%	41%	34%	45%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	68%	53%	15%	48%	20%
	2018	71%	55%	16%	50%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	74%	19%	71%	22%
2018	87%	73%	14%	71%	16%
Compare		6%			

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

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	61%	37%	61%	37%
2018	98%	62%	36%	62%	36%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	60%	38%	57%	41%
2018	100%	60%	40%	56%	44%
Compare		-2%			

**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	28	53	50	52	59	56	24	66	15		
ELL	54	69		71	71	73					
ASN	89	74		100	74		86		89		
BLK	59	38		82	75		9				
HSP	72	63	67	85	70	76	61	85	72		
MUL	85	58	83	92	79	85	83	90	72		
WHT	81	65	67	92	68	70	71	95	78		
FRL	72	63	62	86	70	71	60	86	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	21	33	32	34	67	66	9	58	20		
ELL					80						
ASN	85	75		89	63		85	93	100		
BLK	45	37	45	55	63	67	36	46			
HSP	75	63	64	79	58	58	64	89	77		
MUL	67	52	45	86	53	75	61	87	76		
WHT	80	59	50	91	66	79	73	90	82		
FRL	64	52	49	80	58	73	61	82	69		
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	34	59	59	40	48	43	29	56	21		
ASN	77	62		85	77			90			
BLK	36	63		55	63		20	77			
HSP	72	62	60	82	64	56	70	83	81		
MUL	65	58	54	85	74	67	65	77	58		
WHT	80	70	69	88	67	67	78	92	77		
FRL	70	65	62	75	62	59	67	81	73		

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	681
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
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%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	68
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	72

Hispanic Students	
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	81
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	76
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	71
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.**

Upon analysis, our ESE students and African American students showed a lower performance related to their peers school-wide. Achievement gaps exist in academic areas related to their white and other ethnicities within the student subgroups. Most Notably, from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019, the performance of African Americans in all tested subjects showed an increase except for science. Performance by African Americans on the science test showed a drop of 27% points from the 2017-2018 school year to the 2018-2019 school year. Trends show that this has existed consistently over the last several years.

Trends relating to ESE saw an increase performance in all categories except Math. ESE students who were making learning gains in math decreased by 8% from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019.

Additionally, our SWD in our lowest 25% saw a decrease of 10% in those students making math learning gains.

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

School-wide, our science scores dropped overall and in the various subgroups. In the 2017-2018 school year, 70% of students were proficient in science. In 2018-2019, only 69% of students scored as proficient on the Science End of Course exam. Factors that may have influenced this included a lack of standards-based instruction in the years leading up to the assessment (6th, 7th and 8th ), a deeper need for vertical articulation between the middle/elementary schools and consistent exposure to FSA/EOC level questions in the classroom. Performance by African Americans on the science test showed a drop of 27% points from the 2017-2018 school year to the 2018-2019 school year. Contributing factors to this also include a low-sample size that ranges between 18 and 22 students for this statistical category.

**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.**

For the 2018-2019 school year, DeLaura outperformed the state and district average in all reporting categories. However, the category where we were closest to matching the state average was "ELA Learning Gains" and only beat the state average by ten percentage points.

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

When analyzing data for the 2018-2019 school year, our largest improvement was in "ELA learning gains of the lowest 25%" which increased by 21% points. Actions that facilitated this improvement include an increase in our push-in and ESE certified teachers serving our ELA classes, a renewed focus on standards aligned instruction and a focus on building relationships with our most needy students. Additionally, excellent instruction in our tier 2 & tier 3 intervention classes (including ILA) allowed all students to access grade-level content and increase their mastery of the standards.

**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 concerns is our students with 90% or less attendance for the school year. Efforts to build connections with the students and their families is a high priority.

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

1. African American subgroup performance on achievement tests
2. ESE subgroup performance on achievement tests
3. Continue effort to improve building relationships with all students
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	<p>Improve Proficiency in all student subgroups, specifically targeting ESE and African American students in all measured academic areas</p>
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>ESE students showed proficiency in the following levels: 28% on FSA ELA, 52% on Math FSA, and 66% on the Civics EOC. Significant achievement gaps exist between our SWD and our general education students. SWD achievement gaps for the following core subjects included 52% in ELA, 39% in math, 45% in Science and 27% in Civics.</p> <p>Additionally, our African American students have shown lower proficiency levels than students in our other demographics/ethnicities. One potential cause includes a relatively low sample size (ranging from 18-23 students) which can skew data due to the few number of students assessed. However, improvements targeting our various subgroups will be implemented with fidelity.</p>
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>Measured outcomes for SWD in the following areas will have an expected outcome of continuing the upward trends:</p> <p>ELA Proficiency: 4% Increase            Math Proficiency: 8% Increase            Sci Proficiency: 7% Increase            Civics Proficiency: 4% Increase</p> <p>Measured outcomes for African Americans in the following areas will have an expected outcome of continuing the upward trends:</p> <p>ELA Proficiency: 7% Increase            Math Proficiency: 8% Increase            Sci Proficiency: 10% Increase            Civics Proficiency: 4% Increase</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	<p>Jeremy Lebrun (lebrun.jeremy@brevardschools.org)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Implementation of grade-level PLC'S to analyze subgroup data, align student tasks with targeted standards, share instructional practices school-wide and identify at-risk student subgroups for remediation &amp; enrichment. PLC's will meet with the purpose of providing supports for the areas of identified deficiencies. Evidence-based instructional practices and research (Same, Guarino et al) articles/interventions will be provided for staff to provide background on potential solutions. Professional development and articles related to subgroups will be provided consistently to all instructional personnel.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Rationale for this strategy includes the utilization of feedback from a variety of sources including classroom observations, subgroup performance data on state assessments, faculty survey data, and research relating to a PLC's effectiveness. Prior to this new initiative, we had department level meetings and faculty meetings but neither of those were used to analyze subgroup data, review standards aligned student tasks or provide interventions for identified at-risk student groups. Using this additional PLC model combined with actions already in place, we will have a positive impact school-wide on all student groups with additional growth in our SWD and African American populations.</p>
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create Grade-Level PLC groups and establish a school-wide meeting day</li> <li>2. Establish School-wide PLC agenda that includes sharing of standards aligned student tasks, cross-curricular opportunities, review of under performing subgroups (SWD, African</li> </ol>

- American), at-risk student intervention ideas and sharing of instructional practices
3. Admin will model and facilitate all grade-level PLC's to maintain fidelity to the practice
  4. At-risk and subgroup data will be reviewed monthly, utilizing FOCUS reports, to see impact of strategy
  5. Students will be targeted at the individual level for intervention in the classroom, remediation/enrichment activities and relationship building among all faculty.
  6. Create At-risk accountability mentor group for identified students with multiple Early Warning indicators. Students will be tracked weekly by admin and guidance on grades, attendance and behavior referrals.
  7. PAR allocation will be used to hire an additional ESE Push-in teacher to support SWD in MESH courses and provide additional resources for students

**Person Responsible** Laura Barna (barna.laura@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).**

DeLaura is in year two of a three year cycle implementing initiatives that follow our big three goals: (1) Standards-based instruction with aligned student tasks (2) Building positive relationships with all students and (3) Excellent parent and community communication. In addition to our main area of focus detailed above, a secondary improvement priority is to ensure that 100% of students at DeLaura have at least one caring adult on campus that knows them on a deeper level than the traditional "student" and "educator". The rationale for this is based on research that students who have one caring adult and feel connected to the school, are less likely to drop out.

DeLaura is implementing new initiatives, to be combined with our current ones, to help further ensure that 100% of our students have at least one caring adult on campus.

Student relationship building initiatives include:

(1) "One Caring Adult Tracker" Spreadsheet - This tool will be used to track students who have successfully built a relationship with a teacher, counselor or admin team member. Sent out to staff weekly by the Principal, employees will "check-off" on a spreadsheet any students that they have built a deep, caring & meaningful relationship with. expectations for this definition include that it goes beyond the normal class knowledge of the student. This provides all team members a visual of what students have not yet made a connection and provides data for us to use when finding students who are at-risk of feeling disconnected.

(2) At-Risk Mentor Program - Each Administrator, counselor and SRO selected students to have weekly check-in's with, monitor grade progress, track attendance data and be held accountable for their performance. Students will also be provided invitations, guidance and strategies when using our schools remediation/enrichment time on Friday's.

(3) Student recognition programs & Clubs - DeLaura has school-wide student recognition programs that identify students of not only high academic status but also based on character, community service and other non-academic ways a student can connect to the school. Additionally, DeLaura's project 17 club sponsors initiatives to help promote kindness and welcome new students to our campus with a "buddy" program that helps integrate new students into the environment.