

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Summerville Advantage Academy



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

Summerville Advantage Academy

11575 SW 243RD ST, Homestead, FL 33032

<http://www.summervillecharterschool.com>

Demographics

Principal: Marjorie Lopez

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2019

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)	86%
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: C (51%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: C (50%)
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

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

Summerville Advantage Academy

11575 SW 243RD ST, Homestead, FL 33032

<http://www.summervillecharterschool.com>

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	81%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	97%

School Grades History

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

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.

Summerville Advantage Academy exists as an International Learning Environment, which develops adaptive and active learners who embrace the exploration of other cultures as well as their own ancestral heritage through the utilization of art, music, and literature to excel and achieve academic heights.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision for Summerville Advantage Academy is to provide students with a challenging and rigorous curricula enabling students to be well prepared for secondary education and life through adherence to an unwavering mission, shared purpose, and clearly articulated goals.

Students will experience a cross curricula instructional approach using the Sunshine State Standards and benchmarks.

"Improving Student Achievement" will serve as the school's "mantra" and improvement will be facilitated and measured through a systematic and total organizational approach to leadership and management using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM).

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
Coats, Archalena	Principal	
Manas, Joanie	Dean	
Arbesu, Anaeli	Instructional Coach	
Castellon, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	
Gonzalez, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Bryant, Robin	Teacher, K-12	
Miranda, Helmat	Teacher, K-12	
Hagen, Julia	Teacher, K-12	
Cummings, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	

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	72	78	97	106	75	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	514
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	

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	0	0	0	0	
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)

514

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/13/2019

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	3	3	9	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	10	17	13	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	35	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	4	6	16	4	24	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	3	3	9	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	10	17	13	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	35	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	4	6	16	4	24	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	48%	63%	61%	51%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	61%	59%	56%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	57%	54%	48%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	53%	67%	62%	60%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%	63%	59%	66%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	56%	52%	55%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	55%	56%	56%	56%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	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	72 (0)	78 (0)	97 (0)	106 (0)	75 (0)	86 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	514 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (3)	0 (3)	0 (9)	0 (4)	0 (6)	0 (6)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (31)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (7)	0 (10)	0 (17)	0 (13)	0 (9)	0 (9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (65)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	21 (20)	17 (35)	15 (29)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	53 (84)

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	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
	2018	65%	61%	4%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	64%	-19%	58%	-13%
	2018	43%	60%	-17%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
05	2019	55%	60%	-5%	56%	-1%
	2018	52%	59%	-7%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	67%	-18%	62%	-13%
	2018	61%	67%	-6%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	69%	-27%	64%	-22%
	2018	59%	68%	-9%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2019	72%	65%	7%	60%	12%
	2018	62%	66%	-4%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	53%	1%	53%	1%
	2018	58%	56%	2%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	50%	-50%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

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					
2018					

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					
2018					

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	27	20		40	60						
ELL	48	59	59	55	53	33	54				
BLK	45	52		45	63		63				
HSP	49	52	49	54	55	39	53				
FRL	47	49	49	54	58	47	55				
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	36			57							
ELL	46	49	50	55	58	63	58				
BLK	51	71		51	64						
HSP	56	59	54	62	63	47	63				
FRL	55	59	51	64	64	48	55				
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
ELL	35	48	44	50	62	56	46				
BLK	48	71		48	44						
HSP	51	55	50	62	69	58	58				
WHT	47	42		69	64		60				
FRL	51	55	44	60	66	50	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	51
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	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37

Students With Disabilities	
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	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	54
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	49
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	
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	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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was 4th grade Math (42%).

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year was 3rd grade ELA (-20%).

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 4th grade Math (-22%).

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 5th grade Math (+10%).

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

After reflection on the EWS Data from Part 1 (D), the area of greatest concern is the percentage of students scoring Level 1 on State Assessments.

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

1. Analyzing data to align, plan for and improve instruction school wide.
2. Alignment of curriculum and instruction and insure that materials utilized are standards based.
3. Set high expectations for teachers and students and motivate them in the process.

4. Giving meaningful feedback to teachers regarding instruction, etc.
5. Increase parental involvement and engagement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase student achievement in Reading in Third Grade.
Rationale	The data indicates that third grade students performed lowest when compared to the same grade performance from the previous.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The third grade ELA teachers will implement small group differentiated instruction on a daily basis. This will insure that students are receiving individualized learning goals to show growth in the targeted areas. Students will also receive targeted intervention in those targets areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Archalena Coats (acoats@summervilleadvantageacademy.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	The teachers will be provided with ongoing professional development to improve instruction. This will allow teachers to provide effective and quality instruction using the core curriculum. There will be ongoing progress monitoring to insure that students are responding to instruction. Data collection and analyzing of student data will be used to drive instructional decisions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers and Instructional leaders will work as a team to identify resources and interventions needed in addition to the core curriculum, for those students that are not responding to instruction and are in need of additional support.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Daily/Weekly Classroom Walk Throughs and Informal and Formal Observations. 2. Weekly Lesson Plan Checks. 3. Provide Instructional Coaching and Targeted Walk Throughs by Coaches. 4. Complete Progress Monitoring Plan (PMP) by Teachers. 5. Conduct Data Chats with Teachers and Students to drive instruction.
Person Responsible	Archalena Coats (acoats@summervilleadvantageacademy.com)

#2	
Title	Increase Math achievement in Mathematical Problem Solving
Rationale	The data indicates that fourth grade students performed lowest in in mathematics compared to the same grade performance from the previous year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The math teachers will implement exploratory hands-on lessons using Envisions Math manipulatives in math lessons.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Anaeli Arbesu (aarbesu@summervilleadvantageacademy.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide instructional support needed for teachers to help students improve mathematical problem solving strategies to better understand real-world problems. Teachers will be provided with ongoing professional development to improve instruction using the core curriculum. There will be ongoing progress monitoring to insure that students are responding to instruction. Data collection and analyzing of student data will be used to drive instructional decisions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers and instructional leaders will work as a team to identify resources and interventions needed in addition to the core curriculum, for those students that are not responding to instruction and are in need of additional support.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Daily/Weekly Classroom Walk Throughs and Informal and Formal Observations. 2. Weekly Lesson Plan Checks. 3. Provide Instructional Coaching and Targeted Walk Throughs by Coaches. 4. Complete Progress Monitoring Plan (PMP) by Teachers. 5. Conduct Data Chats with Teachers and Students to drive instruction.
Person Responsible	Archalena Coats (acoats@summervilleadvantageacademy.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).

The remaining school wide improvement priorities will be addressed by improving instruction in all content ares. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to: adjust the delivery of of curriculum and instruction to meet specific needs of all students, adjust the delivery of the behavior management system, adjust the allocation of school based resources, drive decisions regarding targeted professional development and identify and develop interventions.

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.

The school plans to offer Parent Academies on a variety of topics to assist Parents with ways to support their child in becoming well rounded academically and socially. We have also scheduled parent meetings and events at a variety of of times (morning, afternoons and evenings) to accommodate a variety of parent work schedules/availability. We also plan to have multiple activities that allow the parents to interact with the teachers, community members and Admin team.

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.

Summerville ensures that the social-emotional needs of all students are met via character education, school-wide positive behavior support, mentoring programs, athletic programs, clubs, and community service opportunities. Summerville also uses the online learning platform, MobyMax, in which students enjoy learning while using technology. Summerville awards the students who master their assigned standards. In addition to MobyMax, we use MYON Reader Science Gizmos as well. Students are recognized for their achievements for their usage of our on-line learning programs.

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

Incoming:

Students from local schools are invited to attend Meet & Greet and Open House events prior to the school year starting to offer information to parents and students. Incoming students are invited to a Summer Event in June in order to tour the building and meet the teachers.

Outgoing:

We have feeder pattern information nights for our outgoing fifth graders who are preparing for Middle School. Our feeder pattern school also hosts a field trip for our fifth graders so the students are able to spend the day following the schedules of a sixth grader to give the students a first hand experience of a middle school student.

Additionally, school participates in a public lottery. This school also gives preferences to siblings and military families. We also advertise via our school's website and Facebook.

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.

Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to: adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students, adjust the delivery of the behavior management system, adjust the allocation of school-based resources, drive decisions

regarding targeted professional development, create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions. Managed data will include FAIR, Interim and Baseline Assessments, Performance Matters Managed data, CELLA assessments, MobyMax Assessments, In-house Reading, Writing, Math and Science assessments, FSA Scores, Student Grades, Student Case Management System, In-house behavior database using our school-wide discipline plan, Detentions, Suspensions/Expulsions, Referrals by Student Behavior, Staff Behavior, and Administrative Context, Team Climate Surveys, Attendance, Referrals to Special Education Programs. Assessment Administration and Data Collection Plan will consist of the teacher administering the assessment and submitting for scanning at the end of each session. The Testing Coordinator will collect all assessments from teachers, scan all assessment bubble sheets, access reports from Performance Matters for all assessments by grade level → Benchmark Specific. Reports will be submitted to Administration & Grade level lead via email. Grade level lead will dissect data with team at grade level meeting. Grade Level Meeting Minutes will explain findings. Principal and Assistant Principal will work with Grade Level Leads to discuss strengths and weaknesses and develop plan for remediation that targets bubble students and our lowest 25%. Also, Title I funds will be allocated to fund our school's reading and math coach to provide teachers with the necessary training to meet student's needs. Funds will also be used for Interventionist, tutoring, technology and educational resources.

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

Not Applicable

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase student achievement in Reading in Third Grade.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Math achievement in Mathematical Problem Solving	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00