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**Lee Elementary School**

7731 US 90, Lee, FL 32059

<http://les.madison.k12.fl.us/>

**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 87%

### Primary Service Type Charter School

(per MSID File)

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

K-12 General Education No 32%

**School Grades History**

### Year Grade

**2017-18**

B

### 2016-17

C

### 2015-16

C

### 2014-15

A\*

**School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Madison 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.](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**

Inspired Learning! We believe if we inspire our students, all of them will learn. Inspiration comes through establishing a warm, creative environment where students feel not only physically safe and secure, but confident enough to aim for high expectations. All staff members participate in the cultivation of our positive atmosphere with encouraging words and constant support for our students.

### Provide the school's vision statement

We want students to leave Lee Elementary with the academic skills as well as the character traits that will make them successful in life.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

**Name Title**

Brown, Amanda Principal

Phillips, Susan Guidance Counselor

Gonzalez, Rebecca Teacher, ESE

Maultsby, Susan Teacher, ESE

Smith, Lisa Teacher, K-12

Mabardy, Delores Teacher, K-12

### Duties

**Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making**

Amanda Brown is the Principal and instructional leader of the school. She creates schedules and secures resources to identify and support all students at all levels of learning. Susan Phillips is the Curriculum Coordinator/ MTSS Coordinator for the school. She provides support to teachers working through the MTSS process to help identify students with specific needs and provides the necessary steps to ensure that these students receive the resources they need to be successful. She also identifies those students that need ELL supports and services. She ensures teachers have the specific curriculum resources needed to meet the needs of all students, regardless of the level of student. Rebecca Gonzalez and Susan Maultsby are the ESE Support Facilitators for the school. They provide the in-class support for all ESE students, as well as provide the testing accommodations provided by each of these students' IEPs. They also support students working through the MTSS process and help teachers with providing documentation on students who are working through this process. Lisa Smith is the ELA teacher for 5th grade. She provides reading, writing, and social studies instruction.

Delores Mabardy is the math and science teacher for 4th grade, but has numerous years

of experience in the lower grades.

### Early Warning Systems Year 2017-18

**Indicator**

**Grade Level**

**Total**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 5 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

**Grade Level**

**Total**

**K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12**

**Indicator**

Students exhibiting two or more indicators

4 3 1 3 12 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 26

### The number of students identified as retainees:

**Indicator**

**Grade Level**

**Total**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 5 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |

**Date this data was collected**

Sunday 8/26/2018

### Year 2016-17 - As Reported

**Indicator**

**Grade Level**

**Total**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

**Grade Level**

**Total**

**K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12**

**Indicator**

Students exhibiting two or more indicators

### Year 2016-17 - Updated

**Indicator**

**Grade Level**

**Total**

1 0 3 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 11

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

**Grade Level**

**Total**

**K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12**

**Indicator**

Students exhibiting two or more indicators

1 0 3 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 11

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**Assessment & Analysis**

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

### Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The lowest data component was the Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile for Math. This is not a trend due to the increase from the prior year by 12%.

### Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

There were no areas that showed a decline from the prior year. Lee Elementary School increased in all areas.

### Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The learning gains for the Math Lowest Quartile was 3% below the state average. This is the only area where we fell below the state average; all other areas were above the state average.

### Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component showing the most improvement is the Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile in ELA. The improvement was 23%.

### Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area

The Lowest Quartile students were targeted from the beginning of the year. They were identified, teachers were notified, and those students received extra support and interventions throughout the day. These students were receiving interventions during their daily TEAM time (intervention block), as well as time at a different point in the day.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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** | **2018** | | | **2017** | | |
| **School** | **District** | **State** | **School** | **District** | **State** |
| ELA Achievement | 60% | 64% | 56% | 52% | 51% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 58% | 60% | 55% | 48% | 47% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 60% | 50% | 48% | 38% | 47% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 74% | 74% | 62% | 66% | 72% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 55% | 57% | 59% | 43% | 60% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | 44% | 47% | 38% | 48% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 61% | 48% | 55% | 39% | 48% | 51% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey** | | | | | | | |
| **Indicator** | **Grade Level (prior year reported)** | | | | | | **Total** |
| **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 (12) | 7 (8) | 4 (5) | 2 (10) | 8 (7) | 2 (2) | 31 (44) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 4 (2) | 6 (2) | 13 (4) | 4 (0) | 28 (8) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 5 (2) | 10 (0) | 5 (7) | 4 (2) | 3 (1) | 2 (0) | 29 (12) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 7 (4) | 11 (11) | 6 (5) | 24 (20) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level Data**  **NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.** | | | | | | |
| **ELA** | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School- District**  **Comparison** | **State** | **School- State**  **Comparison** |
| 03 | 2018 | 56% | 55% | 1% | 57% | -1% |
|  | 2017 | 58% | 55% | 3% | 58% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% |  | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | |  |  | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 63% | 48% | 15% | 56% | 7% |
|  | 2017 | 55% | 43% | 12% | 56% | -1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% |  | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% |  | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 47% | 38% | 9% | 55% | -8% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ELA** | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School- District**  **Comparison** | **State** | **School- State**  **Comparison** |
|  | 2017 | 41% | 31% | 10% | 53% | -12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% |  | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -8% |  | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MATH** | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School- District**  **Comparison** | **State** | **School- State**  **Comparison** |
| 03 | 2018 | 75% | 60% | 15% | 62% | 13% |
|  | 2017 | 81% | 66% | 15% | 62% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% |  | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | |  |  | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 76% | 56% | 20% | 62% | 14% |
|  | 2017 | 68% | 52% | 16% | 64% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% |  | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -5% |  | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 59% | 44% | 15% | 61% | -2% |
|  | 2017 | 45% | 33% | 12% | 57% | -12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 14% |  | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% |  | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCIENCE** | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-**  **District Comparison** | **State** | **School-**  **State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2018 | 56% | 38% | 18% | 55% | 1% |
|  | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison | |  |  | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subgroup Data** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 | 53 |  |  | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HSP | 57 | 60 |  | 86 | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 62 | 57 | 60 | 71 | 55 | 42 | 76 |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 51 | 55 | 55 | 72 | 58 |  | 63 |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | 43 |  |  | 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HSP | 56 | 62 |  | 89 | 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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** |
| WHT | 55 | 47 | 18 | 63 | 43 | 31 | 30 |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 49 | 41 |  | 60 | 42 |  | 29 |  |  |  |  |

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

### Areas of Focus:

Increase Learning Gains of Math Lowest Quartile by 15% (from 50% to 65%)

as measured by the 2019 administration of the Math Florida Standards Assessment

This area was the lowest of all of the categories at 50%. Increasing the learning gains of the lowest quartile will also increase the category for Learning Gains, which was the next lowest category at 55%.

**Title**

**Rationale**

**Activity #1**

**Intended Outcome**

**Point Person**

The intended outcome would be that the Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile for math will increase from 50% to 65%.

Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)

Action Step

Intentional and specific purpose is incorporated into the teacher's schedule so that there is additional time and support given to the identified lowest quartile students. These students will also receive support in small groups by the ESE

### Description

**Person Responsible**

support facilitators. Materials that will be used will be i-Ready toolbox resources, Reflex Math, and Zearn. The classrooms are also provided with paraprofessionals to assist in working with small groups on specific math skills. Teachers are also focusing on math fluency to increase the speed in which they are able to complete math problems.

Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Students will be monitored through class assignments, teacher observations, fluency assessments, and progress on Reflex Math. Students will also be

### Description

**Person Responsible**

monitored through the passing rate of their i-Ready lessons on their individual learning path. Data from the i-Ready diagnostics will also be used to monitor the growth of these students.

Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)

Increase ELA Learning Gains by 12% (from 58% to 70%) as measured by the

2019 administration of the English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessment

58% of the students made learning gains in ELA. This was the lowest category of the ELA section.

**Title**

**Rationale**

**Activity #2**

### Intended Outcome

**Point Person**

The intended outcome is that 70% of the students will make a learning gain in ELA.

Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)

Action Step

As the data was reviewed, it became obvious that one area where gains were not made was the higher-leveled students. Teachers have their data on their current students and what their scores were the previous year and whether they did or did not make a gain. The TEAM time groups will also focus on the students who are proficient and provide differentiated instruction to extend their knowledge and thinking that will take them to the next level. They will use the "next steps" section of the teacher toolbox for activities that will provide growth for these students on higher-order skills.

### Description

**Person Responsible**

The addition of Top Score Writing this year to 3rd grade should also help to increase the ELA scores of all of our tested students. This curriculum provides explicitly detailed instructions and directions on how to teach the writing the way that it is tested on FSA. It also builds reading skills within the writing instruction.

The 3-5 teachers are also incorporating the Engage NY ELA curriculum into their ELA instruction. This curriculum uses novels based on science and social studies topics. The questioning and activities that are provided in this curriculum naturally lends itself to engaging the students with higher-order thinking.

Fluency, across grades K-5, has become more and more of a problem in the area of ELA. Without fluent readers, students can not comprehend material on grade level due to the length of time it is taking students to get through a passage. As the students get older, the passages are longer in length, and low fluency becomes an even bigger issue for the ELA student. Teachers in K-5 are completing timed fluency assessments on all students on a weekly basis. This is entered into the gradebook as a test grade. Saxon Phonics is used in grades K-2. Grades 3-5 have access to the iReady toolbox, which has phonics tools for those students who are not fluently reading.

Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Classroom assessments, teacher observation, AR scores and goals, i-Ready lesson passage rates, weekly fluency test scores, and writing assessments in

### Description

the Top Score Program are ways that we will monitor the effectiveness of the action steps. Students will also take an i-Ready diagnostic assessment to monitor student growth.

### Person Responsible

Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)

## 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 Pilot SIP 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

LES will hold Parent Universities throughout the year. One goal of this initiative is to bring parents in to meet with the teachers to discuss ways that parents can become involved with helping with their child's academic progress at home. The school feels that by providing instruction to the parents on strategies they can use to help their child, it will build a positive relationship between the school and home. At the Parent University, parents will be provided with instruction and tools to use at home with their children. These items include individual dry erase boards, markers, erasers, kitchen timers, fluency binders, and other activities that parents can do at home that will benefit the classroom.

### 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

Teachers refer students who may need mentoring or counseling to the MTSS team. The team meets with parents and the teacher to determine possible solutions. If parents are in agreement, the team refers the students to the appropriate entity for support. Parents are informed of the services of Mr. Glen Graves - child counselor.

The Principal and Curriculum Coordinator have been trained in youth mental health first aid. All teachers will receive the 8-hour training by January 2019.

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

Lee Elementary School serves 18 Pre-K students. Pre-K teacher, Heather Douglas, has been a Pre-K teacher for 17 years, and keeps well informed on procedures and changes in Pre-K instruction. Our community has a local Pre-K which also stays in regular communication with our school, especially at the end of the school year and beginning of the school year, helping with transitions for specific students into our kindergarten program. All incoming kindergarten students complete a kindergarten screener with the Principal. This screener helps to determine a "snapshot" look at the incoming students. This also gives the Principal an opportunity to make a connection with the new students and parents. This time allows the parents to ask questions. This provides the foundation for building relationships with the

new families and students.

At the end of the year, the 5th grade students go on a guided tour of MCCS. On this tour, they are able to see the different areas of the school, as well as hear about special programs that the students will be able to participate in as 6th graders.

### 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

Teachers use a "Class Snapshot" sheet at the beginning of the year to identify students in their classroom who may already have or need special services (ELL, 504, etc.)

Our MTSS/RTI packet begins with a "Request for Assistance" when the teacher realizes a student is not being successful. A parent conference is held and a plan is outlined for small group, individualized and/or after-school help for the student. Progress is monitored monthly.

Title 1 - Our school uses Title 1 funds for instructional supplementary materials, after-school tutoring, and parental involvement activities.

Part C Migrant - Migrant funds are used for instructional materials such as bi-lingual library books, after-school tutoring, and extended year summer program for migrant students.

Title X Homeless - Homeless funds are used for assisting students needing school supplies, school clothes, and tutoring.

Supplemental Academic Instruction - SAI Funds have been used to provide extended school year activities for students not meeting expectations.

Nutrition - Our school receives funds for universal breakfast and lunch for all students. Both meals are available for any and every student. The school also works with the local extension office to provide nutrition education to students in Pre-K, Kindergarten, and 1st grade. Once a year, the school hosts the Madison Farm Bureau for Ag Literacy Day.

Volunteers come in and go to each class to teach the students about farm-raised foods that provide good nutrition.

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

LES provides opportunities for our students to observe community helpers by hosting a K-9 presentation by local law enforcement. Specific grade levels travel to the fire department, post office, and courthouse to learn about the various areas of community helpers and the service they provide to the community. At various times throughout the year, community members come in and volunteer their time to read to our students and discuss their careers and how their careers affect the community.

## Part V: Budget

**$0.00**

**Total:**