

Orange County Public Schools

Eagles Nest Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	16

Eagles Nest Elementary

5353 METROWEST BLVD, Orlando, FL 32811

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

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Adams

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
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)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: D (36%)
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	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	16

Eagles Nest Elementary

5353 METROWEST BLVD, Orlando, FL 32811

<https://eaglesnestes.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	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	98%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	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
Adams, Lisa	Principal	
Johnson, Andrea	Assistant Principal	
Wright, Lovelle	Teacher, ESE	
Harden, LaTonya	Teacher, K-12	
Diaz, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Backherms, Cara	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	94	79	98	127	117	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	608
Attendance below 90 percent	26	22	16	33	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	5	4	8	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	23	14	19	24	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	57	48	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	9	5	7	27	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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)

45

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/16/2019

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	24	27	33	18	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	6	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	19	10	32	27	39	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	48	57	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

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	6	1	11	32	43	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116

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	24	27	33	18	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	6	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	19	10	32	27	39	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	48	57	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

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	6	1	11	32	43	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116

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	42%	57%	57%	44%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	58%	58%	57%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	52%	53%	62%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	63%	63%	48%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	61%	62%	56%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	48%	51%	50%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	56%	53%	35%	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	94 (0)	79 (0)	98 (0)	127 (0)	117 (0)	93 (0)	608 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	26 (24)	22 (27)	16 (33)	33 (18)	7 (24)	15 (24)	119 (150)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	5 (4)	4 (3)	8 (6)	4 (1)	13 (11)	34 (26)
Course failure in ELA or Math	23 (19)	14 (10)	19 (32)	24 (27)	5 (39)	2 (1)	87 (128)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	57 (48)	48 (57)	62 (62)	167 (167)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	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.

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	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
	2018	38%	55%	-17%	57%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	57%	-17%	58%	-18%
	2018	37%	54%	-17%	56%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	34%	54%	-20%	56%	-22%
	2018	41%	55%	-14%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	62%	-15%	62%	-15%
	2018	56%	61%	-5%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	63%	-9%	64%	-10%
	2018	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	31%	57%	-26%	60%	-29%
	2018	29%	59%	-30%	61%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	37%	54%	-17%	53%	-16%
	2018	34%	53%	-19%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	13	35		16	38	40					
ELL	34	59	71	51	60	62	41				
BLK	41	51	52	47	47	44	46				
HSP	43	72	81	51	51	59	29				
FRL	42	56	62	45	47	44	44				
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	19			29							
ELL	39	60	50	45	29	24	25				
BLK	42	51	48	46	34	43	33				
HSP	44	64	62	60	42	8	53				
FRL	44	53	50	51	35	33	39				

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	16	50	60	11	38		10				
ELL	34	60	67	36	50	50	15				
BLK	41	54	58	48	55	50	34				
HSP	55	74	80	39	55		50				
FRL	44	57	62	48	56	50	35				

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	52
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	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	55
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	47
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	58
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
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 ELA Achievement component showed the lowest performance at 42%. The biggest contributing factor was that most of our resource support and intense intervention was provided to students in the lowest 25th percentile versus whole group instruction during the ELA block.

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

The ELA Achievement component also showed the greatest decline from the prior school year. Last year ELA Achievement was at 45% and this year it dropped to 42%. Most of our efforts were focused on improving intervention and providing support to our lowest 25th percentile.

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.

Both ELA Achievement and Math Achievement had the greatest gaps when compared to the state average. Both of these components were 15% lower than the state averages. Resource teachers were used to pull-out and push-in to support our lowest 25th percentile during the school day. They were able to provide students with additional time with the content during the school day.

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

Math lowest 25th percentile showed the most improvement during this school year. Resource teachers were used to provide additional support outside of the math block for these students to be able to address learning gaps with the math concepts. We also encouraged the use of manipulatives and had fact fluency competitions.

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

An area of concern is third grade. It has the greatest number of students that have two or more indicators.

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

1. Continued improvement of developing standards-based lesson plans.
2. Continued improvement of lesson delivery in the classroom.
3. Focused work in teacher table and centers to both preview and remediate.
4. Support the lowest 25th percentile during intervention and pull-outs/push-ins.
5. Focused support for ESE ESSA subgroup to include services in the classroom and with pull-out.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Student achievement will increase across content areas by teachers implementing rigorous standards-based instruction, monitoring subgroup data, and incorporating strategies discussed with school-based leadership.
Rationale	ELA Achievement levels dropped from 45% to 42% and is 15% below the state average. Math Achievement levels dropped from 50% to 48% and is 15% below the state average. With support from administration, instructional coaches, and district program specialists, teachers will be able to improve their implementation of standards based instruction..
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>ELA Achievement at the end of the 2019-2020 school year will be at 60%, an 18% improvement.</p> <p>Math Achievement at the end of the 2019-2020 school year will be at 60%, a 12% improvement.</p> <p>Science Achievement at the end of the 2019-2020 school year will be at 60%, a 17% improvement.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Adams (lisa.adams@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School-based leadership team will support and monitor the teacher implementation of standards-based lessons. Professional development will be provided as needed to support teachers with classroom strategies. School-based leadership team will also facilitate planning and model lessons as needed and teachers who still need support will go through the coaching cycle. 2. School-based leadership team will support and monitor the teacher implementation of small group, differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Overall, improved whole group instruction and improved small group, differentiated instruction will allow students to improve on the skills required to demonstrate understanding of the Florida Standards and thus close the achievement gap.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School-based leadership team will collaborate with teachers during common planning to address lesson delivery. 2. School-based leadership team will collaborate with teachers on developing questions to be used during small group instruction based on individual learner needs. 3. School-based leadership team will consistently conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor the effectiveness of both whole group instruction and small group instruction. 4. School-based leadership team will provide teachers with immediate, actionable feedback. 5. Teachers will incorporate culturally responsive teaching strategies in order to meet individual learner needs. 6. Teachers will closely monitor and address the needs of ESE students in the small group teacher table. (ESSA-subgroup)
Person Responsible	Lisa Adams (lisa.adams@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Student achievement will increase in ELA for ESSA sub group: ESE students when teachers implement close reading strategies through the use of standards-aligned, text dependent questioning.
Rationale	Using strategies learned through the District PLC, teachers will provide ESE students with both grade-level text and with scaffolded material to provide support and practice in answering standards-aligned text dependent questions.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	ESE ELA Achievement will increase from 13% to 30% ESE ELA Learning Gains will increase from 35% to 50% ESE Math Achievement will increase from 16% to 30% ESE Math Learning Gains will increase from 38% to 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Adams (lisa.adams@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will use close reading strategies to increase ESE student achievement in ELA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Using strategies learned from school-based leadership professional development, teachers will provide ESE students with both grade-level text and with scaffolded material to provide support and practice in answering standards-aligned text dependent questions.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School-based leadership will support teachers with the development of standards-aligned text dependent questions for grade-level texts. 2. School-based leadership will consistently conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor the effectiveness of close reading strategies and will provide feedback. 3. Teachers will work closely with their ESE students to provide the support needed for them to be succesful with the standards. 4. Intervention schedules will be created to provide extra support in small group pull-outs for ESE students during the school day. 5. ESE resource teacher will attend ELA planning to provide input and understand how to support ESE students outside of the lesson.
Person Responsible	Lisa Adams (lisa.adams@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).

N/A

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.

Eagle's Nest Elementary plans to build positive relationships with parents and families by providing parent workshops and family engagement events that are academic in nature and teach parents how to assist their child with continual learning at home. In turn, these relationships will be collaborative in nature allowing for student achievement to increase by strengthening the home-school connection through collaborative partnerships with families and the surrounding community.

Eagle's Nest has created a Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) that will assist in providing high quality instruction for all learners by providing resources for parents. Parents will be able to learn skills and different ways to help their children at home as a result of attending parent events where the school will model these behaviors. Additionally, there will be several different curriculum nights aligned to the state standards where students and families will have access to curriculum that is needed to help students be successful academically.

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.

All instructional staff and many classified staff are assigned at least one student mentee. The staff meets with their mentees weekly to "check in" and promote positive culture throughout the building. In addition, the students can participate in a lunch buddy group and social skills class with members of the behavior team. We have additional assistance from outside resources such as social workers and counselors that provide one-on-one counseling. On occasion college students and members from various churches from our community will volunteer as mentors to help students with homework or any social and emotional needs. Additionally, our school psychologist is available to also work with groups of students to address social skills, anger management and support groups as needed. Additionally, the teachers on campus have started "talking" groups to discuss overall issues and concerns.

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

All kindergarten students are assessed using the Florida Kindergarten Readiness test (FLKRS). This tool is used to measure the progress of foundational reading skills. This assessment is completed within the first 20 days of school. Eagle's Nest will test all current kindergarten students who participated in our Voluntary Prekindergarten Education Program (VPK). The goal is to show a 3% increase based on FLKRS data (score 70% and above). Data will be used to plan daily academic and social instruction for all students. Teachers will determine if supplemental instruction is needed for small groups and/or individual students. Core academic and social instruction will be provided by the teacher. Supplemental instruction may also be provided by the teacher or could be provided by a paraprofessional or support staff member. Teachers will utilize the social behavior observation checklist to determine if students are progressing in the social development.

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.

The Eagle's Nest leadership team has the following systems in place to identify and align all available resources in order to meet the needs of students and maximize desired outcomes.

Our leadership team works collaboratively with our district-based curriculum and instruction team as well as the leadership of the Southwest Learning Community team. These teams will support Eagle's Nest through classroom walkthroughs, coaching, and common planning. Additionally, the Corrective Programs team will provide ongoing support to Eagle's Nest through school visits and collaborative meetings with the principal.

The school-based leadership team meets every Friday to review common planning meetings, classroom walkthroughs and evaluations, coaching, problem-solving discussions and overall school needs. Based on these meetings, additional resources are allocated to support rigorous classroom instruction and student interventions.

The grade-level PLC/common planning meetings are supported by a member of the leadership team. During these meetings each leadership team member is responsible for supporting the teams in developing rigorous units of study for each subject area. During this time, it is determined what instructional materials will be used and what materials need to be provided.

In addition, each grade level meets with the leadership bi-weekly for data meetings. During these meetings, formative/summative assessment and intervention data is reviewed to determine next best steps to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired outcomes. This includes allocation of available instructional materials through funding resources.

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

College pennants and flags have been strategically placed throughout the school to encourage conversations about post-secondary academics. Additionally, all classrooms with have "Class of..." signs to promote high school graduation.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student achievement will increase across content areas by teachers implementing rigorous standards-based instruction, monitoring subgroup data, and incorporating strategies discussed with school-based leadership.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student achievement will increase in ELA for ESSA sub group: ESE students when teachers implement close reading strategies through the use of standards-aligned, text dependent questioning.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00