

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Frost Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Frost Elementary School

3950 S FALKENBURG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Temeka Lewis

Start Date for this Principal: 4/29/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Frost Elementary School

3950 S FALKENBURG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	85%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Frost Elementary will provide the best education by utilizing resources to maximize the potential of all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Frost Elementary will provide an excellent learning environment that will promote high student achievement.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mikell, Tiffaney	Principal	<p>Principal is responsible for creating and working with a Leadership team which can include the following staff who will serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making:</p> <p>Assistant Principal / ELP Coordinator SAC Chairperson Guidance Counselor School Social Worker School Psychologist Academic Resource coaches (Reading , Math, Science) ESE teachers Behavior team representative Grade level Team leaders / chairs</p> <p>The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g. weekly, bi-weekly/ monthly) for the purpose of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborating and problem solving to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices. 2. Reviewing data and the utilization of the the Rti/MTSS process to ensure that the process is done with fidelity and student supports are established to enhance and promote academic / behavioral growth. 3. Providing ongoing progress monitoring of core instructional data and reviewing the attainment of SIP goal(s) (curricular, behavioral, and attendance) 4. Providing communication of school-wide data to PLCS, and facilitating ongoing professional development activities based upon data to support instructional growth within the content standards and grade level teams.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 4/29/2019, Temeka Lewis

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 .	

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	91	83	93	73	86	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	16	16	21	14	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	11	10	3	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	94	80	96	102	77	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	528
Attendance below 90 percent	30	20	23	22	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	12	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	11	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	3	8	3	5	16	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	
Number of students enrolled	94	80	96	102	77	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	528
Attendance below 90 percent	30	20	23	22	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	12	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	11	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	3	8	3	5	16	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	55%	52%	57%	43%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	58%	41%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	50%	53%	40%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	54%	54%	63%	44%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	57%	62%	45%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	46%	51%	29%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	46%	50%	53%	27%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
	2018	60%	53%	7%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	55%	4%	58%	1%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
	2018	38%	51%	-13%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	54%	0%	62%	-8%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	57%	-3%	64%	-10%
	2018	51%	57%	-6%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	61%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	51%	-7%	53%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	52%	1%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	47	52	40	47	38	17					
ELL	39	42		42	58	60					
BLK	49	58	47	46	59	61	38				
HSP	54	57	58	55	57	53	50				
MUL	73	60		55	50						
WHT	68	44		73	64		50				
FRL	50	54	45	49	58	56	38				
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	32	50	42	50	61		42				
ELL	25	61		38	75	64	20				
BLK	58	58	67	53	65	58	50				
HSP	52	68	57	54	67	67	54				
MUL	50	60		79	60						
WHT	57	56		70	91		67				
FRL	52	60	61	55	66	58	52				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	17	28	30	25	52	43	8				
ELL	21	28	42	18	21	15	10				
BLK	39	46	43	38	46	26	20				
HSP	39	36	31	41	36	24	37				
MUL	47	50		41	50						
WHT	56	28		60	59						
FRL	40	39	30	40	43	27	27				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	429
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

In 2018, Student math gains were 70% and in 2019, student math gains were 59%. This was 11% decrease in Math learning gains.

In 2018, students in the bottom 25% made learning gains of 63%, and students in the bottom 25% made learning gains of 57%. This is a decrease of 6% in the bottom quartile for learning gains in Math.

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

The data component showing the greatest area need is our Math bottom 25% and ELA proficiency. When analyzing school comparison data, Grade 3 ELA decreased by 10%. In 2018 they scored 60% and in 2019 scoring 50%. In 2018, the data showed statewide 3rd grade proficiency was at 58% with

a gain of 3%. In 2019, statewide 3rd grade proficiency was at 57%, with a decrease of 8%. This indicates a need to focus on the bottom quartile in our Math and our ELA proficiency.

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.

Science Achievement had the greatest gap compared to the state average. (School =46% vs State=53%) Possible contributing factors included the lack of resources specific to the standards throughout the grade levels. There was a possible lack of adequate progress monitoring that was inconsistently analyzed to support deficiencies.

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

Maintained at least a 50% proficiency level in all subject areas and most grades. The proficiency level of ELA only decreased by 1%. In 2018, the ELA proficiency was 56% and in 2019, the ELA proficiency level was 55%. PLC planning was consistent and data analysis was completed with fidelity.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities 40%
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year.

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

1. The bottom quartile (lowest 25%) in reading with a focus on SWD students.
2. Learning gains in Math
3. Science proficiency
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Educators will have high expectations and opportunities for students to engage in rigorous tasks. Many students are engaged in lessons that do not continuously reach the cognitive complexity level required for all students to master the grade level standards. When teachers have high expectations for students and provide tasks that are engaging and of high interest, students build self-esteem, increase confidence and improve academic performance.

Measurable Outcome: Student proficiency will remain above 50% in reading, math, and science. Learning gains will reach 60% in reading and math for the 2020-2021 school year, as evidence by the 2021 FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffaney Mikell (tiffaney.mikell@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Standards based planning
2. Individualized instruction through lesson differentiation

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Standards based instructional planning will provide teachers with the skills and tools necessary to challenge students and unlock their potential.
2. Individualized instruction through lesson differentiation pin-points the specific intervention and enrichment needs of students. This will be essential with SWD.

Action Steps to Implement**1. Standards Based Planning**

*Teachers will participate in grade level/subject area planning sessions (with reading, math, and RTI coaches on a weekly basis, team planning weekly in PLCs). Completed planning templates will be uploaded and monitored with feedback through Office 365 shared drive.

*VE/ESE, ESOL Resource Teacher will participate in grade level planning sessions weekly to ensure SWD and ELL students are engaged in grade level content. Planning templates will be made available for all VE/ESE teachers as well as ELL paras in order to align their work with these subgroups.

*Through planning, Math Coach will lead teachers in strategies to engage and support African American students in order to increase achievement (small group instruction in class, Lunch Bunch sessions, parent resource packets, etc.)

*RTI Resource teacher will use results of planning activities to track and monitor all ESSA subgroups, providing feedback and data related to each group. Use of a digital data wall will help facilitate this action step.

2. Individualized Instruction

Teachers will actively monitor the progress of students' mastery of the standards while explicitly using strategies connected to the learning targets. Teachers will provide explicit feedback while scaffolding instruction when needed. Students will know their individualized learning goals for standards while being purposefully engaged in individualized learning. Students will know learning targets throughout lessons while utilizing strategy-based anchor charts. Learning targets that are posted will include standard language that establishes a culture of learning marked by high expectations for all students - specifically SWD.

Person Responsible: Tiffaney Mikell (tiffaney.mikell@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

na

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Effective communication is essential for building school-family partnerships. It constitutes the foundation for all other forms of family involvement in education. We work to communicate every child's progress to the parents by sending home quarterly progress alerts and holding parent teacher conferences. School staff, students, parents, and community work collaboratively to improve skills and habits for personal and academic success. We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending home newsletters and flyers, making parent link calls, and posting everything on our website and social media platforms. Parent are invited to join SAC and PTA. Each committee meets monthly to discuss budget, events, and student needs.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.