

Orange County Public Schools

Hunters Creek Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Hunters Creek Elementary

4650 TOWN CENTER BLVD, Orlando, FL 32837

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

Demographics

Principal: Bradley Martin

Start Date for this Principal: 11/15/2018

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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

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	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Hunters Creek Elementary

4650 TOWN CENTER BLVD, Orlando, FL 32837

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

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)
Elementary School PK-5	No	52%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

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

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 communities

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
Urdaneta, Fresia	Principal	
Villaverde, Nicole	Assistant Principal	
Patterson, Ellen	Instructional Coach	
DePriest, Christie	Instructional Coach	
Huertas, Zaida	Guidance Counselor	
Rivera, Milagros	Assistant Principal	
Aviles-Colon, Ginnette	Other	

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	130	136	155	152	175	179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	927
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	15	6	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	25	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	0	3	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	0

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/23/2019

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	13	16	16	20	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	35	45	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	12	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	13	16	16	20	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	35	45	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	12	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	70%	57%	57%	75%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	58%	58%	68%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	53%	63%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	77%	63%	63%	77%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	61%	62%	74%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	48%	51%	70%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	56%	53%	63%	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	130 (0)	136 (0)	155 (0)	152 (0)	175 (0)	179 (0)	927 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	10 (13)	9 (16)	15 (16)	6 (20)	16 (18)	13 (19)	69 (102)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	2 (0)	2 (0)	0 (2)	0 (4)	1 (0)	5 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (1)	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	4 (2)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (35)	25 (45)	42 (45)	80 (125)

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	66%	55%	11%	58%	8%
	2018	65%	55%	10%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	57%	9%	58%	8%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	62%	16%	62%	16%
	2018	69%	61%	8%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	63%	4%	64%	3%
	2018	68%	62%	6%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	66%	57%	9%	60%	6%
	2018	76%	59%	17%	61%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	53%	5%
	2018	62%	53%	9%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	23	33	17	28	35	21					
ELL	62	59	47	70	61	39	48				
ASN	79	90		85	50						
BLK	60	46		60	46						
HSP	69	61	49	75	62	36	62				
WHT	76	68		84	75		77				
FRL	61	57	48	69	61	36	53				

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	27	24		40	41						
ELL	54	57	47	72	74	67	42				
ASN	80	83		100	100						
BLK	50	53		59	60						
HSP	69	63	50	79	77	68	67				
WHT	77	68		89	79	70	78				
FRL	61	59	47	78	75	64	60				

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	29	48	47	50	86	81	10				
ELL	58	72	73	69	76	71	42				
ASN	83	69		83	77						
BLK	58	62		50	43						
HSP	73	69	65	74	74	75	63				
WHT	79	67	64	84	77	69	74				
FRL	66	66	66	70	70	67	48				

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	64
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	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	509
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	59
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	76
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
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	63
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	76
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	59
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.

The lowest performance component on the FSA was mathematics learning gains for the bottom 25 percent. The contributing factors to last year's low performance were the lack of mathematics intervention, decline in student attendance for Saturday school, inconsistency with mathematics centers, and utilizing data to inform instruction. Our data reflected a trend in both fourth and fifth grade learning gains with a decline of 11 points, which indicates that this is an area of improvement.

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 prior year was fifth grade mathematics. The contributing factors to last year's low performance were the lack of mathematics intervention, decline in student attendance for Saturday school, inconsistency with mathematics centers, and utilizing data to inform instruction.

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.

When analyzing the FSA data, we found that our mathematics data showed the biggest gap when compared to the state average. Proficiency in third grade mathematics had a difference of sixteen percent above the state average. Overall, English Language Arts did show the greatest positive difference when compared to the state averages. Third and fourth grade English Language Arts also showed a positive gap of eight percent when compared to the state average.

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 third grade mathematics compared to the previous year. The actions that contributed to this improvement was due to effective and consistent collaboration within the third grade Professional Learning Community (PLC).

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

Upon reflecting on the EWS data, an area of concern is our students with disabilities.

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

1. Deconstructing standards
2. Blueprinting assessments / backward lesson planning
3. 30 minutes of whole group instruction followed by 30 minutes of mathematics centers
4. Analyzing data to drive instruction and intervention
5. Reteach and reassess based on data

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Planning
Rationale	Based on learning gains from Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) a direct focus needs to be placed on student subgroups in both English Language Arts and mathematics in order to increase individualized student growth.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	With continued focus on teacher collaboration within Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), teachers will increase the effectiveness of meeting the need of subgroups while planning instruction. Our focus subgroups are students with disabilities (SWD), English Language Learners (ELL), Hispanics and African American. This will increase individualized student growth in Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) learning gains for English language arts, mathematics, and science in all subgroups by 3 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Fresia Urdaneta (fresia.urdaneta@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will analyze student subgroup data in order to plan to incorporate culturally responsive text in culturally relevant instruction. Ongoing multicultural activities will happen within the classroom throughout all content area; for example, multicultural fair, research based projects, celebrating Hispanic and African American month. Through teacher collaboration within Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) teachers will share strategies that drive effective differentiated standards-based instruction (whole/small group). Within the classroom teachers will set expectations and goals with all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers meet weekly within Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to analyze subgroup data to determine areas of deficiency within the standard and plan effective differentiated instruction. Implementation will be monitored through lesson plans, student work, instructional resources, data collection, classroom observations, and school-wide activities.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development- culturally relevant instruction 2. Collaborative lesson planning 3. Community resources 4. Multilingual Parent Leadership Council (MPLC)
Person Responsible	Fresia Urdaneta (fresia.urdaneta@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Academic Writing
Rationale	Based on learning gains from Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), a direct focus on academic discourse targeting oracy to develop writing strategies needs to be placed in all content areas.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Through continued professional development, teachers will increase the effectiveness in using academic discourse in all content areas. PLCs will collaborate to develop writing strategies including a focus on academic vocabulary, differentiate small group instruction, and continue the implementation of Close Reading Strategies. This will lead to an increased number of students demonstrating proficiency on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) English Language Arts from 70 percent to 75 percent (overall), 48 percent to 53 percent for the lowest 25 percent of students in ELA, and on the Science Florida Comprehension Assessment Test (FCAT) an increase from 66 percent to 70 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Nicole Villaverde (nicole.villaverde@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The instructional team will facilitate professional development sessions for teachers throughout the school year. Classroom teachers will plan, teach, and facilitate opportunities for students to use academic discourse to support writing across all content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of academic discourse will be monitored through lesson plans, data collection, peer observations, and classroom observations.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership Team Book Study- Leading Well; Lucy Calkins 2. Text dependent and writing professional development 3. Grade level PLC collaboration on writing 4. Data driven mini lessons 5. Conferring with students 6. Small group instruction
Person Responsible	Nicole Villaverde (nicole.villaverde@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).
NA

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.

NA

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.

Every year we host a Kindergarten Roundup for incoming kindergarten students. Parents visit the school with registration information and are welcomed to view the campus. We also offer school tours anytime during the school year or summer. During the first week of school, we transition kindergarten parents and students throughout the week by allowing them more access to the classroom during the morning than in the upper grades.

Every year we host a Two Way Dual Language Orientation for incoming magnet students. The parents receive a model lesson of what a student expects to see during a typical dual language day while also receiving information about the program including transitions, content area (which language they are taught) and how the model works to ensure bi-literacy.

For our outgoing fifth graders, students visit their attending middle school for a tour and orientation of what a typical day is like at the middle school level.

Grades K through five vertically plan to ensure students have been taught prior skills necessary for the upcoming grade level. Teachers collaborate to determine prerequisite skills necessary for mastery in the upcoming grade.

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

We used previous years' standardized assessments such as Florida Standards Assessments (FSA) and i-Ready assessments to begin our initial analysis of student placement data. As a school, our continual progress monitoring is completed through the use of school-based common assessments, standards-based assessments, and i-Ready assessments. i-Ready data is analyzed for differentiation of instruction. Fountas and Pinnell (F & P) data is used from the previous school year to initially place students. All grades use school-based standards assessments, grade-level common assessments, and ESOL/ACCESS testing data. FSA data for reading and math (grades three through five) and Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) for fifth-grade science testing results are analyzed in order to address core instruction for small group and individual student needs. In order for all data to be analyzed, the MTSS team including administration, staffing specialist, CRT, guidance counselor, reading specialist, language therapist, ESE teacher, instructional support, and school psychologist, will gather data from all assessments and collaborate with classroom teachers and resource teachers, who have also disseminated data, to create a plan for each child in the lowest 30th quartile.

School Advisory Council (SAC) money will be utilized to fund a reading tutoring program for third through fifth-grade students who scored in the bottom quartile on the FSA or below the 25th percentile on i-

Ready for 2017-18 school year for third-grade students. Certified teachers will tutor groups of no more than 10 in 45-minute sessions twice a week after school. This supplemental instruction will strengthen reading skills and strategies for these students, which will result in increased student achievement.

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.

We offer "Conversations with the Counselor", which are parental meetings that offer strategies for parents to prepare their students for college and career readiness by discussing topics such as "Is it too early to choose a career?" In addition, we offer our fifth grade students "Career Day" where Partners in Education come and discuss the varying businesses that are represented at our school through parents and community partners. As a school initiative, each Wednesday teachers and staff wear college shirts to represent a college and spark interest with the students.

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

NA

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Planning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Academic Writing	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00