
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
R.A.I.S.E	0
Positive Culture & Environment	18

Gretchen Everhart School

2750 MISSION RD, Tallahassee, FL 32304

<https://www.leonschools.net/everhart>

Demographics

Principal: Jane Floyd Bullen

Start Date for this Principal: 9/16/2022

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	ESE
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	47%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Unsatisfactory 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Unsatisfactory 2017-18: Unsatisfactory 2016-17: No Rating
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon County School Board.

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Gretchen Everhart School
Where Everyone is Exceptional!

Striving for quality of life,
one student,
one success at a time.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that each individual is unique, differing from all others in types of attributes and degree of endowment. Each individual should be allowed to grow and develop to his/her greatest potential intellectually, physically, socially, and emotionally.

We believe that educational programming should be designed to meet the needs of each student as an individual rather than trying to fit the student into already established programs.

We believe that it is the joint responsibility of the home, school, and community to cooperatively provide the environment and experiences to enable each individual to develop his/her maximum potential.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Gretchen Everhart School is a special education school that serves students from age 3 - 22 years of age. The school currently has one Pre-K classroom with students who have mild to extensive special education support needs. The rest of the school serves students from kindergarten to 12th grade in addition to students who have deferred their diploma until age 22.. Students have been identified as requiring special education services due to an Intellectual Disability and other related disabilities in the significant ranges requiring extensive support needs. The school serves students from Leon County as well as students from 5 neighboring counties (Wakulla, Jefferson, Liberty, Gadsden, Franklin) when their counties don't have the supports to meet the needs of the students. The school has one of the two transition programs for the district for students who have deferred the receipt of their diploma until age 22.

Students that attend the school require a low student to staff ratio and assistance with dressing, feeding, toileting, self care, safety, in addition to assisting with a variety of ways to communicate their needs to others. The instruction for each student is individualized to meet the needs of the student as identified in their Individual Education Plan.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Floyd-Bullen, Jane	Principal	<p>The Principal facilitates the work of the School Advisory Council and oversees the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. The Principal delegates tasks to the appropriate individuals and monitors the completion of tasks. The Principal, with the help of key stakeholders, determines the needs of the school, develops the School Improvement Plan, monitors and reports the progress of the school in meeting the goals. The Principal helps the school with the ongoing work of continual school improvement.</p>
Pittinger, Betsy	Other	<p>Betsy Pittinger, ESE Teacher, is the Learning Advocate (Staff Development) representative for the school and also serves on the Curriculum Committee. In her role as both staff development and curriculum committee member she helps the school determine professional development activities and appropriate curriculum and materials that will help the school meet the instructional needs of the students and the goals of the School Improvement Plan. She serves on several state committees and helps inform the work of the school based on her knowledge of state and district initiatives.</p>
Hutchins, Zellanye	Reading Coach	<p>Zellanye Hutchins is the SITE Facilitator, Reading Coach and also serves on the School Advisory Council for the school. She facilitates the monthly meeting of the SITE committee which is comprised of members from each department. As the SITE Facilitator and Reading Coach she assists the Principal in continual work on ongoing school improvement through the identification of needs and solutions with input from all stakeholders.</p>
Benedix, Courtney	Instructional Technology	<p>Courtney Benedix, the Instructional Technology teacher, helps the school utilize the technology needed to help students make progress and to help staff best meet the needs of the school. The Instructional Technology teacher along with the work of the technology committee (SITE) determine the ongoing needs of the school and allocates time and resources accordingly.</p>
Thompson, Lori	School Counselor	<p>The school guidance counselor / referral coordinator, helps facilitate the weekly Problem Solving Team in their work of identifying and supporting the needs of the students. The guidance counselor helps ensure that students receive the supports that are needed to help them benefit from instruction.</p>

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

N/A

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 9/16/2022, Jane Floyd Bullen

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

110

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

26

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

26

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

2

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

26

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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	1	4	3	4	5	4	6	9	8	13	6	37	100
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	3	2	4	1	1	2	5	2	5	0	10	35
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	5	6	5	5	4	4	38
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	5	6	5	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	4	2	4	3	2	5	6	3	0	2	0	32

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	3	1	3	1	1	2	5	1	3	0	2	22

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/20/2022

2021-22 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	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	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	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

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement		46%	55%					60%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								50%	54%
Math Achievement		40%	42%					60%	62%
Math Learning Gains								60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								49%	52%
Science Achievement		43%	54%					59%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		52%	59%					64%	78%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	4	27		3	13					90	
BLK	9	50		8							
WHT		10									
FRL											

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	6	30		6	31		12				
BLK	14	27									
WHT		31		13							
FRL		36		8	30						

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	5	28	60		26						
BLK	5	32			40						
WHT	3	30			18						
FRL	3	26			33						

ESSA Data Review

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	27
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	137
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
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	22
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	3
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	3
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	3
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	3

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
 Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?

We compared the achievement levels of students who were administered Datafolio assessments to those assessed using Performance Task assessments. We concentrated on increasing the number of students assessed on Datafolio assessments.

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

We showed the most improvement in Science. We distributed materials and manipulatives that could be used to provide instruction in science.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

We need to improve in the area of math. There is not great instructional materials to use to help with math instruction.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Students that are assessed on Datafolio have higher achievement levels than those assessed using Performance task assessments.

What strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Increase teacher training and use of more appropriate Datafolio assessments.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders.

Datafolio training was provided by the state at the school this summer. Those that weren't able to participate have the opportunity to do online training in the fall. A support group has been formed for those teachers using Datafolio assessments.

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Most of our students are scoring Level 1 on ELA Assessments. 76% of the students maintained or improved skill level on Task 1. We did have an increase in students scoring Level 2 or higher by using Datafolio Assessments. 30% scored Level 2 or higher on Performance Task assessments and 80% scored Level 2 or higher on Datafolio assessments. Overall 49% scored Level 2 or higher.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

80% of the students that are tested will maintain or improve skill level on Task 1.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This will be monitored through monthly navigational meetings and monthly progress monitoring tools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jane Floyd-Bullen (floydj@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

use of adapted grade level appropriate reading materials

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Evidence from DOE and the state ACCESS Project in addition to research and collaboration with FSU

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will provide reading instruction with fidelity using a variety of school / district / state endorsed curriculum and strategies leading to increased student performance

Person Responsible

Zellanye Hutchins (hutchinsz@leonschools.net)

Use of Unique Learning Systems Curriculum

Use of novel study by departments

Effective use of progress monitoring tools with the Unique Learning Systems curriculum.

Person Responsible

Christy Fulater (fulaterc@leonschools.net)

Utilize the DOE Project Access Weebly for resources and strategies. Book study on Comprehensive Literacy for All and other identified books on instruction for students with significant disabilities and extensive support needs.

Person Responsible

Betsy Pittinger (pittingerb@leonschools.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41%

threshold according to the Federal Index.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We showed a decrease in scores from last year. 41% of the students that were tested maintained or improved skill level on Task 1. 21% scored Level 2 or higher on Performance Task assessment. 67% scored Level 2 or higher on Datafolio assessments. Overall 32% scored Level 2 or higher in math.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

50% of the students that are tested will maintain or improve skill level on Task 1.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This will be monitored through monthly navigational meetings and monthly progress monitoring tools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jane Floyd-Bullen (floydj@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers will discover and use additional resources and strategies and effective ways to progress monitor achievement in the area of math from the Access Project, Collaboration with FSU and research leading to improved scores on the state assessment

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Effective instruction on Access points requires specialized resources and strategies.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will discover and use additional resources and strategies and effective ways to progress monitor achievement in the area of math leading to improved scores on the state assessments.

Person Responsible

Betsy Pittinger (pittingerb@leonschools.net)

Teachers will use the resources made available through our district, state Access Project and FSU and will collaborate with others through training. Peer Observations, and Navigational meetings to best provide instruction in math using a variety of materials and strategies.

Person Responsible

Christy Fulater (fulaterc@leonschools.net)

Use of adapted tools such as adapted calculators, number lines, learning kits, etc.

Person Responsible

Jane Floyd-Bullen (floydj@leonschools.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Science is one of the areas measured by state assessments and is an area that helps students with success in critical life skills. 87% of the students tested in science correctly answered 5 or more items. 30% scored Level 2 or higher on Performance Task assessments, 89% scored Level 2 or higher on Datafolio assessments and overall 58% scored Level 2 or higher in science.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

90% of the students tested in science will correctly answer 5 or more items out of the 16 items assessed.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This will be monitored through monthly navigational meetings and monthly progress monitoring tools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jane Floyd-Bullen (floydj@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Use of specialized curriculum that presents adapted grade level content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Resources used are recommended by DOE Access Project, district curriculum developer and other special education center school principals in the state of Florida.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will collaborate with others through training, peer observations and navigational meetings to best provide instruction in science using a variety of materials and strategies.

Person Responsible

Jane Floyd-Bullen (floydj@leonschools.net)

The curriculum committee will solicit input from teachers on the key materials needed to best provide instruction in science. Science kits will be provided for each classroom teacher to assist in providing science instruction.

Person Responsible

Zellanye Hutchins (hutchinsz@leonschools.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

PBIS linked to classroom management strategies

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

The school has a Behavior Support Team that helps monitor the implementation of behavioral plans and interventions and helps to maintain the safety of the students and staff. The school also has a Positive Behavior Support Team that meets monthly to make sure behavioral needs are met school wide.

The school collaborates and has the support of many outside agencies such as Everhart Excellence Foundation, Special Olympics, Pilot Club, Elks Club, etc..to help with our efforts in using PBIS.

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

The behavioral data is shared with teacher monthly.

The Problem Solving Team is involved in determining when additional evaluations and supports may need to be put in place and involves all of the key stakeholders.

Behavioral Case Management meetings are held monthly and on an as needed basis to review progress on action steps and involves the key stakeholders.

Behavioral data is shared with guardians when requested in addition to every nine weeks and when a new Individual Education Plan is developed. Progress is also shared daily/weekly in the Student Planner.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Progress will be monitored through a review of the data monthly at the Behavior Support Team Committee meetings. Interventions to address areas of improvement are also developed during those monthly meetings.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Offer training in C.P.I. to all staff Offer training in T.E.A.C.H. to select staff Provide ongoing skill instruction to identified staff Utilize a Positive Behavior Support Committee Utilize a Behavior Support Response Team Provide training to Paraprofessionals and Teachers on effective behavioral strategies and recording of data.	Floyd-Bullen, Jane, floydj@leonschools.net