

Orange County Public Schools

Oak Hill Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oak Hill Elementary

11 S HIAWASSEE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

<https://oakhilles.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Cicely Marks

Start Date for this Principal: 7/3/2010

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: D (37%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
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 Orange 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	8
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oak Hill Elementary

11 S HIAWASSEE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

<https://oakhilles.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

Elementary School
PK-5

2018-19 Title I School

Yes

2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

100%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

93%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridaCIMS.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and

using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

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
Jones, June	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making and ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS.
Damers, Agustin	Assistant Principal	Provides support and guidance for the common vision for the use of data-based decision making and science instruction.
Welch, Pamela	Instructional Coach	Develops curriculum related support materials, leads Curriculum Planning Team projects and teacher meetings, provides support for the unpacking of core content standards and programs, assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection and analysis, plans/provides professional development and school improvement plan implementation process.
Prater, Robert	Dean	Provides guidance and leadership in the area of student conduct and the development of making parent/student/teacher/school connections.
Weaver-Baker, Terica	Guidance Counselor	Provides support and guidance in meeting the overall needs of students. Conducts MTSS related meetings as needed, for the purposes of intervention, parent communication and student guidance.
Medrano, Tamara	Instructional Coach	Coordinates guidance on the school reading and math plan, provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III interventions of reading/math plans with specific focus on decreasing the disproportionate classification in Special Education and English Language Learners.
Singh, Kiran	Instructional Coach	Coordinates guidance on the school reading and math plan, provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III interventions of reading/math plans with specific focus on decreasing the disproportionate classification in Special Education and English Language Learners.

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	78	89	75	75	105	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	8	11	7	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	5	0	5	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	1	7	19	28	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	25	46	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	1	17	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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)

34

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/22/2019

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	16	9	10	7	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	4	1	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	4	16	19	16	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	35	28	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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	2	1	5	17	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	16	9	10	7	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	4	1	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	4	16	19	16	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	35	28	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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	2	1	5	17	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	47%	57%	57%	43%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	58%	58%	46%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	52%	53%	45%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	63%	63%	60%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	61%	62%	65%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	48%	51%	48%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	56%	53%	32%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	78 (0)	89 (0)	75 (0)	75 (0)	105 (0)	75 (0)	497 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	8 (16)	11 (9)	7 (10)	7 (7)	7 (10)	7 (12)	47 (64)
One or more suspensions	5 (4)	0 (1)	5 (2)	2 (2)	6 (3)	5 (2)	23 (14)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (2)	1 (4)	7 (16)	19 (19)	28 (16)	33 (34)	89 (91)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	25 (35)	46 (28)	35 (34)	106 (97)

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	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
	2018	50%	55%	-5%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	57%	-15%	58%	-16%
	2018	36%	54%	-18%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
	2018	40%	55%	-15%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
	2018	50%	61%	-11%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	63%	-11%	64%	-12%
	2018	48%	62%	-14%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	54%	57%	-3%	60%	-6%
	2018	51%	59%	-8%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	37%	54%	-17%	53%	-16%
	2018	27%	53%	-26%	55%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	14	35	25	9	35	29					
ELL	43	47	25	59	66	45	31				
BLK	47	42	28	57	60	38	44				
HSP	43	50	35	53	63	42	31				
WHT	53	50		82	75						
FRL	45	46	35	55	58	35	47				
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	8	25	29	24	20	9	8				
ELL	25	33	35	35	34	22					
BLK	46	43	38	51	38	22	26				
HSP	38	41	31	45	43	27	33				
WHT	35	36		67	36						
FRL	43	46	39	51	39	24	30				
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	10	14	13	23	50	43					
ELL	33	46	60	46	63	50	15				
ASN	73			70							
BLK	39	39	44	61	64	43	32				
HSP	48	54	50	58	66	33	22				
WHT	37	50		56	64						
FRL	43	46	46	60	66	49	32				

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	47
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	377
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	46
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	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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
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
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	65
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	47
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.

Oak Hill's ELA Lowest Quartile showed the lowest performance. Oak Hill scored 31% proficiency for the Lowest Quartile in ELA, which was a decrease of 7% from the previous year. Continued professional development (PD) on ELL and ESE instructional strategies is still needed as the majority of students in the bottom 25% fall in these subgroups.

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

Oak Hill's ELA Lowest Quartile showed the lowest performance. Oak Hill scored 31% proficiency for the Lowest Quartile in ELA, which was a decrease of 7% from the previous year. Continued PD for teachers on ELL and ESE instructional strategies is still needed as the majority of students in the bottom 25% fall in these subgroups.

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 greatest gap between Oak Hill and the State was in the ELA bottom 25% component. Oak Hill scored 31% while the state scored 53%. Oak Hill's ELL population has grown. Oak Hill will continue to provide PD for the teachers to build capacity in using strategies to help all students grow academically.

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

Oak Hill showed the most improvement in Math Learning Gains growing from 41% to 62%, a 21% gain. With an intense focus on math instruction and strategies, students benefited from increased teacher capacity in this subject area.

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

Oak Hill had 91 students that had failed either ELA or Math per the EWS data. This is a continued area of concern that we will be focusing on this year as these students fall in our Lowest Quartile in both subjects.

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

1. ELL Student Proficiency
2. ESE Student Proficiency
3. ELA Lowest Quartile
4. Math Lowest Quartile

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improving SWD subgroup proficiency
Rationale	Per ESSA, Oak Hill scored 26% in the component for Students with Disabilities.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will improve our SWD performance outcomes from 26% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	June Jones (june.jones@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers within the Professional Learning Community (PLC) will plan for differentiated instruction. We will monitor this by attending PLC's and monitoring instruction in the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated instruction provides teachers with opportunities to meet students where they are and scaffold up to grade level standards.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coaches, SLD teacher and Administration will work with teachers in PLC's to plan for differentiated instruction 2. Coaches and Administration will review FSA and iReady data to determine student groupings 3. Teachers will monitor their students' groupings with iReady and Formative assessments to fluidly meet individual student needs. 4. Staffing specialist and SLD Teacher will provide push in and pull out support for SWD. 5. Instructional coaches will model and/or side by side coach tiered teachers in differentiated instruction strategies. 6. The formative and summative data along with information collected from classroom walk-throughs and i-Observation will be used to monitor the effectiveness of the PLC process on student achievement. 7. Review of lesson plans and assessment data sheets including students' formative and summative data will occur.
Person Responsible	Agustin Damers (agustin.damers@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Improving learning gains for the Lowest Quartile
Rationale	Data in the Lowest Quartile in ELA decreased from 38% to 31%. Math data showed and increase from 24% to 39%. While this was a gain in math, it is still below the district and state averages.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA Lowest Quartile gains to 40% and Math Lowest Quartile gains to 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Agustin Damers (agustin.damers@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will implement of the Multi-Tiered System of Support process for academics with fidelity. Instructional coaches and Administration will monitor and observe the use of resources and instruction during FBS. We will also examine progress monitoring data to ensure students are showing growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Oak Hill needs to improve the implementation of the MTSS process in order to best meet the needs of all of our students. Teachers need assistance in determining the tiered academic leveling of students and the appropriate resources to use during instruction to decrease students deficiencies.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional coaches will facilitate professional development on how to effectively use MTSS to support students' needs. 2. Coaches will support teachers in aligning resources with students individual needs. 3. Designed Instructional groups using iReady groups. 4. In addition to weekly PLC's, we will also look at data at monthly MTSS meetings. 5. Instructional coaches and administration will observe instruction during FBS. 6. The leadership team will monitor student progress using common assessments, iReady, and CRM data.
Person Responsible	Tamara Medrano (tamara.medrano@ocps.net)

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, § 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.

Per ESSA, Oak Hill scored 26% in the component for ESE students. By providing professional development on the delivery of instructional strategies for ESE students, Oak Hill will surpass the 41% mark. Oak Hill will continue to build strong relationships between Teachers, Students and Parents to ensure that it is truly a collaborative effort to build students capacity. Through an intense focus on the MTSS process, all students on all tiered levels will receive the interventions and supports they need to be successful. Teachers will continually receive professional development on ESE and ELL strategies to ensure that we are narrowing the achievement gaps that are present.

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.

Oak Hill ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are met by providing counseling and mentoring services through the Exceptional Student Education programs and SEDNET providers. Our Staffing Specialist and Guidance Counselor meet with teachers, students and parents to discuss potential emotional and/or behavioral issues that can impact learning and provide guidance and support as needed. Guidance and counseling are provided to students who are experiencing emotional or behavioral setbacks, with a specific focus on helping students identify the causes of what is disturbing them. The use of guidance and counseling also minimizes instructional time lost which supports students' academic success. Meetings are scheduled with parents, teachers and support personnel to determine effective intervention and action plans.

Our school provides backpacks and essential school materials free of charge for students in need through the STARS program and approved Partners in Education. Recommendations are made to parents on free community-based services to aid with needs of health, psychological, medical and religious support.

The results of our Best Practices for Inclusive Education (BPIE) assessment support a diverse student population with a full range of students who live in the neighborhood school zone, including those with significant disabilities. Additionally, our 2019-2020 BPIE goal is to increase learning opportunities and resources for Students with Disabilities (SWD) to ensure social and emotional needs of students are met. Moreover, strategies related to an inclusive model for instruction are for the Exceptional Student Education (ESE) teacher to work collaboratively with General Education teachers to devise a plan to meet the needs of the ESE population.

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

At Oak Hill the primary goal for pre-school children is to transition into the public school setting by providing the necessary tools for growth, a conducive environment for learning and a stimulating and developmentally appropriate curriculum. A screening tool is given three times a year for the purpose of establishing baseline data. This screening helps to identify strengths and weaknesses in the areas of language, social/emotional growth, literacy, math and science. Our Pre-K teacher visits the home of each new student who will attend Oak Hill. All parents are invited to join their son/daughter on campus at Oak Hill's Meet the Teacher event and during the first day of school to familiarize themselves with school procedures.

In the spring of each year, 5th grade students visit their feeder middle schools for a tour and orientation. Middle school counselors also visit Oak Hill to talk with students about what to expect in middle school. Parents are also invited to a special middle school orientation night to introduce them to expectations of middle school.

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.

Funds within the general budget are allotted based on each Full Time Equivalent (FTE) and are used to accommodate students, support free/reduce lunch and purchase positions. Title I funds are used to purchase the reading coach, dean and family involvement contact positions. Budget also provides for resources such as text books, computer hardware, software, intervention and supplemental materials. Items are maintained by the district's inventory system.

Title I, Part C Migrant = The migrant department provides services and support to students.

Title I Part D = The district provides funds for the purpose of supporting the Educational Outreach program and support truancy and dropout prevention program.

Title III = The Curriculum Compliance Teacher (CCT) oversees testing, parent meetings, and all dealings with ELL students. The certified ESOL paraprofessionals provide tutoring and support to ELL students.

Title X Homeless = A district social worker works primarily with students who are homeless and communicates with the school's guidance counselor (Terica Weaver-Baker) to support students who are homeless.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) = SAI funds were used to hire a portion of a Reading Coach position who services teachers and students in grades K-5.

Violence Prevention Programs = Mr. Prater (Dean) mentors students who display behavior challenges. Terica Weaver-Baker is the liaison to A Better Therapy (a counseling agency) to aid students with behavior and emotional concerns.

Nutrition Programs = The wellness representative, (Kevin Hermida), heads up the team and

gives tips each month on healthy eating and exercise. Students are encouraged to eat healthy meals each day, starting with the Universal Breakfast program for each student, free of charge at Oak Hill.

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

Oak Hill will encourage parent volunteers and community members to visit classrooms and present information on their individual careers and the paths they took to achieve them. Community members are invited to participate in the annual Teach-In event, a district sponsored career day. College and university names/banners as a representation of colleges attended by staff members and the degrees they have acquired are displayed on classroom doors. Select days during the year are designated as college awareness days, encouraging teachers, parents and students to wear a college t-shirt.