

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Hive Preparatory 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	15
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Hive Preparatory School

5855 NW 171ST ST, Hialeah, FL 33015

www.hiveprep.org

Demographics

Principal: Carlos Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 8/17/2009

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	7%
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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (80%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (65%) 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	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

N/A

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	15
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Hive Preparatory School

5855 NW 171ST ST, Hialeah, FL 33015

www.hiveprep.org

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)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	98%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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 mission of HIVE Preparatory School is to collaborate with stakeholders in creating a Highly Inquisitive Versatile Education that will facilitate a student-centered, adaptable learning environment. The School will provide students with a rigorous academic and social preparation that will promote dignity, courtesy, discipline, responsibility, and high expectations in order to achieve high academic standards and become productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

HIVE Preparatory School establishes the following goals in achieving its vision:

1. Create a safe, nurturing academic environment where all students will achieve high academic standards and professionals are empowered to embrace accountability.
2. Ensure students are exposed to a broad swath of cultural and academic experiences as preparation for success in a global economy.
3. Furnish adequate resources to achieve the School's mission including the recruitment and retention of highly qualified teachers and motivated staff.
4. Deliver an instructional system that will be tailored to individual learning styles including; differentiated instructions, active learning, and learning centers.
5. Serve students with disabilities according to their IEP.
6. Provide a flexible and versatile approach that will ensure continuous improvement of all learners.
7. Maintain an effective level of parental involvement.

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, Carlos	Principal	Contribute to the school improvement process with an emphasis on math and science.
Zequeira, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Contribute to the school improvement process with an emphasis on ELA.
Bonilla, Sergio	Assistant Principal	Contribute to the school improvement process with an emphasis on ESOL and middle school.
Gonzalez, Alejandra	Teacher, ESE	Contribute to the school improvement plan process with an emphasis on special education.

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	135	144	92	74	67	96	79	65	85	0	0	0	0	837
Attendance below 90 percent	6	1	0	2	4	3	1	4	6	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	5	5	4	2	2	10	10	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	5	5	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	29

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

51

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/18/2019

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	0	1	2	1	1	3	5	3	6	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	3	16	3	4	2	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	1	2	6	6	5	6	6	1	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	2	1	1	3	5	3	6	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	3	16	3	4	2	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	1	2	6	6	5	6	6	1	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	81%	63%	61%	76%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	61%	59%	71%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	57%	54%	63%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	88%	67%	62%	82%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	81%	63%	59%	76%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	74%	56%	52%	59%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	86%	56%	56%	78%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	80%	78%	98%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	135 (0)	144 (0)	92 (0)	74 (0)	67 (0)	96 (0)	79 (0)	65 (0)	85 (0)	837 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 (0)	1 (1)	0 (2)	2 (1)	4 (1)	3 (3)	1 (5)	4 (3)	6 (6)	27 (22)
One or more suspensions	2 (3)	0 (4)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (3)	0 (1)	3 (11)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (1)	5 (3)	5 (16)	5 (3)	4 (4)	2 (2)	2 (11)	10 (5)	10 (0)	43 (45)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (2)	6 (6)	5 (6)	5 (5)	6 (6)	4 (6)	3 (1)	29 (33)

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	72%	60%	12%	58%	14%
	2018	83%	61%	22%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	64%	20%	58%	26%
	2018	79%	60%	19%	56%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	86%	60%	26%	56%	30%
	2018	74%	59%	15%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
06	2019	80%	58%	22%	54%	26%
	2018	76%	53%	23%	52%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
07	2019	74%	56%	18%	52%	22%
	2018	78%	54%	24%	51%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	93%	60%	33%	56%	37%
	2018	86%	59%	27%	58%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	87%	67%	20%	62%	25%
	2018	79%	67%	12%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	69%	20%	64%	25%
	2018	83%	68%	15%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	85%	65%	20%	60%	25%
	2018	87%	66%	21%	61%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	84%	58%	26%	55%	29%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	52%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
07	2019	92%	53%	39%	54%	38%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	70%	52%	18%	54%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
08	2019	72%	40%	32%	46%	26%
	2018	27%	38%	-11%	45%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		45%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	89%	53%	36%	53%	36%
	2018	81%	56%	25%	55%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	73%	43%	30%	48%	25%
	2018	72%	44%	28%	50%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	68%	32%	67%	33%
2018	100%	65%	35%	65%	35%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	73%	19%	71%	21%
2018	95%	72%	23%	71%	24%
Compare		-3%			
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	95%	63%	32%	61%	34%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	93%	59%	34%	62%	31%
Compare		2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	41	48	53	56	65	50					
ELL	78	72	61	86	84	79	83	100			
BLK	74	71	61	84	74	61	76	87			
HSP	83	71	61	89	83	76	88	94	83		
FRL	80	72	60	86	81	71	85	94	81		
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	44	43	37	56	58					
ELL	65	73	74	64	61	58		92			
BLK	78	69	75	74	60	43	88	100	90		
HSP	81	73	62	80	68	60	84	96	86		
WHT	83			50							
FRL	81	71	66	79	66	58	87	95	87		
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	22	53	58	47	50						
ELL	61	58	48	75	64	46	62				
BLK	74	63	61	80	78	42	69	100			
HSP	76	72	62	83	75	62	81	98	100		
WHT	91			64							
FRL	77	72	63	83	76	58	81	98	100		

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	80
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	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	799
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
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	80
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	74
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	80
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	78
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.

SWD students scored a 41% proficiency in English Language Arts. This group of students have been identified as struggling learners and are already receiving multiple levels of support. An adjustment to the quality of support was made last year and showed an increase of 20 percentage points. However, this subgroup has consistently under performed when compared to other subgroups.

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile students decreased in proficiency from 65% to 62%. Intensive reading classes were scheduled back to back which led to a "dragging" feeling, according to the classroom teachers. Keeping the kids engaged for such long times proved to be difficult.

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.

HIVE Prep outperformed the State in every category. Thus, the component that outperformed the State the least was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. As mentioned within part b, adjusting the schedules and/or the classroom structures in a way that support student engagement will be the priority.

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

Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed the most improvement. Middle school intensive math was made mandatory for all students scoring a level 1 or 2 in the prior year's FSA. Elementary intervention groups placed a focus on math scores sooner than in previous years.

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

TBA

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

1. SWD ELA scores
2. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
3. 8th Grade Science
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA scores for SWD students
Rationale	This subgroup has consistently been the lowest performing group in the school. While scores improved dramatically from 2018-2019, they were still significantly lower than any other subgroup.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA proficiency for the SWD subgroup by 5 percentage points, from 40% to 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Alejandra Gonzalez (agonzalez@hiveprep.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Individualize the curriculum of interventions
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Currently, interventions focus on subgroup deficiencies. This year, the school will increase the number of individuals involved in interventions so that the SWD students can receive instruction directly related to his/her needs. i-Ready intervention software will be used to determine the needs and multiple classroom resources (core, i-Ready, etc.) will be utilized to instruct.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify individual needs via i-Ready diagnostics 2. Group student according to exact deficiencies 3. Implement intervention program 4. Review student progress (bi-weekly, mid-year diagnostics) 5. Adjust as needed
Person Responsible	Jennifer Zequeira (jlzequeira@hiveprep.com)

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.

See Parental involvement Plan

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.

HIVE Prep embeds a strong focus on Character Education. Respect and responsibility are just two of the values at the heart of the School. The School community lives in an age where technology and social concerns dictate the need for a deepening concern for character. The basic principles for an integrated character education program will include, but not be limited to: the teacher as a caregiver, model and mentor; the classroom as a democratic community; activities that promote values and ethics; encouraging character reflection; discussion of issues and answers, problems and solutions; conflict resolution and students as mediators; parent and community involvement; character education task force comprised of teachers, administration, and parents.

The character education program is integrated through a mentoring program that contains activities that will help to determine how to appropriately infuse character attributes into all social-emotional situations in an effort to empower our students.

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

HIVE Prep will continue to harbor relationships with local VPK programs by developing parent liaison committees and informational orientations regularly. HIVE Prep will participate in the College Bound Parents program: a program that provides information and assistance to incoming kindergarten parents throughout their K-12 years and will assess the incoming Kindergarten students using the FLKRS test as a baseline assessment as well as the CELLA test for the ELL students. Incoming students' social and emotional development will be assessed through the use of ECHOS. Data will be used to plan instruction and determine the need for interventions. Core academic and behavioral instruction is based on data and includes social skills instruction. Throughout the year the students' progression will be continually monitored through our iReady testing.

HIVE Prep hosts three high school transition meetings that prepare and support families as they prepare to apply and attend high school. The first meeting focuses on best practices on applying, comparing, and locating schools. The second meeting involves follow-up to the applications and site-visits. The final meeting is student-centered and how to prepare each child for high school requirements.

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 Leadership Team use the Tier 1 Problem Solving process to set Tier 1 goals, and monitors academic and behavioral data to evaluate progress towards those goals at least three times per year by: Holding regular team meetings where problem solving is the sole focus.

Using the four step problem solving process as the basis for goal setting, planning, and program evaluation during all team meetings that focus on increasing student achievement or behavioral success. Determining how we will know if students have made expected levels of progress towards proficiency? (What progress will show a positive response?)

Respond when grades, subject areas, classes, or individual students have not shown a positive response? (MTSS problem solving process and monitoring progress of instruction)

Responding when students are demonstrating a positive response or have met proficiency by raising goals or providing enrichment respectively.

Gather and analyze data at all Tiers to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by group or individual student diagnostic and progress monitoring assessment.

Ensure that students in need of intervention are actually receiving appropriate supplemental Tier 2 intervention. Gather ongoing progress monitoring (OPM) for all interventions and analyze that data using the Tier 2 problem solving process after each OPM.

Tier 2

The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support. Tier 2 problem solving meetings occur regularly (monthly is suggested) to:

Review OPM data for intervention groups to evaluate group and individual student response.

Support interventions where there is not an overall positive group response

Select students (see SST guidelines) for SST Tier 3 intervention

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

NA

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA scores for SWD students				\$26,178.72
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		100-Salaries	1014 - Hive Preparatory School	Title, I Part A		\$26,178.72
Total:						\$26,178.72