

# Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

**Name of School:**

Enterprise Elementary

**Area:**

North

**Principal:  
Superintendent:**

Theresa A. Lee

**Area**

Dr. Ron Bobay

**SAC Chairperson:**

Jobie Woltman

**Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli**

**Mission Statement:**

Enterprise Elementary's mission is to serve every student with excellence as a standard.

**Vision Statement:**

The Enterprise community is committed to creating lifelong learners and global citizens in a positive and caring environment.

# Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

## RATIONAL - Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

### **Data Analysis from multiple data sources:** *(Needs assessment that supports the need for improvement)*

This year, in analyzing the data, we needed to take into account the change from the previous FCAT to the new current FCAT 2.0. While Enterprise continues to score well and achieve a school grade of A, we noticed several areas of concern. In the previous 3 years of FCAT reading data, we have scored in the low 80% level 3 and above. However, with the new standards, we only scored 68% proficient in reading. While the standards are certainly different, we are quite concerned. In looking further into our reading scores, we noticed that while we scored at 70% and above in the areas of reading applications, vocabulary, and literary analysis, our students only scored 67% in the area of informational text and research. On average, this year, 11.5% of our students in grades 3 through 6, scored a level one. While this is certainly higher than we have seen in many years, the new scoring method may have accounted for this difference. We are encouraged when looking at our lowest 25<sup>th</sup> percent in reading. In 2011, we were looking at only 62% of them making learning gains. In the 2012 test period, we saw an increase to 69% of our lowest 25<sup>th</sup> % making learning gains. Looking at those students scoring at level 4/5 though, we see a decrease from last year's scores of an average of 43% of our students scoring levels 4/5 to only to an average of 31% scoring above grade level. Also looking at our level 4/5 students in reading, we see that 83% of them made learning gains. This is well above average of 68% in the school making learning gains, but still not as high as we would have expected with these above grade level students. Again, knowing the testing changed makes it difficult to gauge exactly the difference in scores, but it is apparent that our students scoring above grade level in reading are not doing as well.

In the 2010-2011 school year, 81% of our students scored on grade level in math (level 3 and above). However, this year, only 71% of our students scored on grade level. Granted, the standards were different, but upon further analysis, we did see some trends that supported this decline. This year, 9.5% of our students were level one in math (up from last year's 6.75%). Our lowest 25<sup>th</sup>% went from 60% to 79%. Those students scoring above grade level (levels 4/5) went from 50% last year to 37% this year. Along those same lines, we noticed a trend of our highest level students not making the learning gains needed. Only 60% of our students in level 4/5 made learning gains this year. In looking at grade level gains in this area, we see that the 60% is slightly skewed due to 6<sup>th</sup> grade showing 92% students in levels 4/5 making gains while 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade only showed an average of 43.5% learning gains among their highest scorers.

In grade level teams, teachers analyzed their data to find out which teaching strategies have been and have not been successful in the classroom instruction over the last three years. In an effort to see their past successes/concerns, they first looked at the two year trend with their students from the previous year. Then they were able to look at their current students and their two year trend data. This allowed them to see where not only their strengths and weaknesses are, but also what they need to do to bring up their current students. Each grade level has shared that more differentiated instruction needs to occur. While our school has done a good job of focusing in on our students with needs, we have missed the mark in challenging our more brilliant students. Teachers were able to identify specific students who need enrichment as well as share ideas of how to enrich them. Specifically in the area of math, our teachers identified that more explicit differentiation needs to occur, both for those above and below grade level. As a school, we identified the current Rtl model for intervention needs to be strengthened in order to meet the instructional requirements of their students to ensure their success.

### **Analysis of Current Practice:** *(How do we currently conduct business?)*

When reflecting on our current practices, we do see that the majority of teachers are utilizing small groups and differentiated instruction in reading ensuring that students are receiving the instruction that they require for

success. However, we recognize the need for even more differentiation to meet student needs. We are now meeting with grade level teams once per month in our Student Data Team Meetings to discuss specific students, identify areas of concern, and work together as a team to come up with an intervention plan. We are then meeting once a month with our “Collaborate to Elevate” meetings to discuss our high functioning students and what can best be done to push these students to even higher levels of success.

Once per month, teachers are working in a professional book study on Lesson Study, led by Sharon Tolson. During this time, teachers are working on how to improve their teaching by working together on delivery, instruction and lesson planning. Through this study, we hope to increase their knowledge of differentiation.

The teachers meet as a Professional Learning Community twice monthly to share best practices, discuss common formative assessments and utilize flexible grouping throughout the grade levels to best meet the needs of the students. Teachers have worked together in their PLCs to identify what strategies have been effective and to set goals for areas needing more work. Teachers are regularly utilizing the A3 data collection and reporting system to easily gather specific data about students. Vocabulary, comprehension and reference/research questions are all areas identified as needing improvement.

In the area of math, we realize that our primary teachers are effectively using manipulatives and small group math instruction. At the intermediate level, we notice a decrease in the amount of small group and differentiated instruction. Intermediate teachers tend to teach whole group rather than in differentiated small groups.

As the numbers and needs of our special education students have increased, we are unable to utilize our ESE department to provide RtI to our general education students. Therefore, we have had to become quite creative when identifying ways to provide intervention support to all students. Teachers are identifying small chunks of time (some as small as five minutes) throughout the day that an intervention group may be pulled. We have successfully utilized the RtI process in reading, but we see a need for more RtI mathematics. Again, utilizing our PLCs, we will be able to work together as a team to develop those specific interventions for mathematics.

In an effort to develop 21st century skills of accountability, every student is keeping a data notebook, taking responsibility for their own learning. Students will use their data notebooks for student led conferences with their parents and teachers. This will enable our students to truly take responsibility for their learning.

**Best Practice:** *(What does research tell us we should be doing as it relates to data analysis above?)*

"Rethinking How We Do School—and for Whom." *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of All Learners*. Carol Ann Tomlinson. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1999. 17-24. *Gale Virtual Reference Library*. Web. 7 Sep. 2012.

- In understanding of psychology and the brain, we know that humans learn best with a moderate challenge. It's important that we remember that a task that is much too difficult causes the learner to go into self-protection mode and they generally won't persist in thinking and problem solving. Likewise, too easy work causes the learner to “coast” into relaxation.
- “A task is appropriately challenging when it asks the learner to risk a leap into the unknown, but they know enough to get started and have additional support for reaching new levels of understanding.”
- Learning tasks must be adjusted to each student's appropriate learning zone and must escalate in complexity and challenge for students to learn continually.

"Leading a Differentiated Classroom." *Leading and Managing a Differentiated Classroom*. Carol Ann Tomlinson and Marcia B. Imbeau. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2010. 1-11. *Gale Virtual Reference Library*. Web. 7 Sep. 2012.

- The teacher's overriding moral purpose is to meet the needs of students, even when it conflicts with personal preferences.—Lorna Earle, *Assessment as Learning*
- Children today are living in a world of personalization.
  - Watch TV show when wanted instead of when broadcast
  - Can own just a song of an album instead of needing to have whole album, even when you don't like any of the other songs!
  - Get news on demand
  - Own computers specifically designed for their own needs
- We, as educators, must find a way to meet kids where they are rather than expecting them to meet demands just because the standards say so.

"The Rationale for Differentiated Instruction in Mixed-Ability Classrooms." *How to Differentiate Instruction in Mixed-Ability Classrooms*. Carol Ann Tomlinson. 2nd ed. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2001. 8-15. *Gale Virtual Reference Library*. Web. 7 Sep. 2012.

- Learning takes place best when three things are in place:
  - Learners must make meaning of what teachers are trying to teach based on prior understanding, learning type, and student attitude about self and school
  - Regardless high quality curriculum and instruction must be in place
  - We must build the bridge between the student and learning in order for them to be successful
- Important to remember that differentiated instruction is not simply giving a normal assignment to most students and different to those struggling or advanced.
- It is planning in terms of "multiple avenues of learning" for varied needs rather than normal/different
- Goal is maximum growth from current "learning position."

## CONTENT AREA:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Science	<input type="checkbox"/> Parental Involvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Drop-out Programs
<input type="checkbox"/> Language Arts	<input type="checkbox"/> Social Studies	<input type="checkbox"/> Arts/PE	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:		

**School Based Objective:** *(Action statement: What will we do to improve programmatic and/or instructional effectiveness?)*

In reading and math, teachers will utilize daily differentiated instruction among all students, teaching them at their individual point of need.

**Strategies:** *(Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives)*

<b>Barrier</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Timetable</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>In-Process Measure</b>
1. Resources for non-fiction	1a. Meet with teachers to determine what non-fiction materials to buy	Administration	October 2012		Team meeting agenda
	1b. Purchase non fiction material	Assistant Principal	November	\$500	Purchase order
	1c. Purchase PebbleGo electronic database for emerging readers	Media Specialist	October 2012	\$760.75	Purchase order
2. Enrichment	2a. Meet with teachers to determine what enrichment materials to buy	Administration	October 2012		Team meeting agenda
	2b. Purchase enrichment material	Assistant Principal	November	\$500	Purchase order
3. Managing personnel allocations	3a. Reexamine use of support personnel	Admin	October		Team meeting agenda
	3b. Reexamine grade level	Admin Classroom teachers	Oct		Team meeting agenda

	schedule				
4. Reading and math groups not being pulled daily	4a. Reworking the classroom schedule to include daily small group instruction time	Grade level teams	October		Classroom teacher schedules; admin walk throughs
	4b. Continue training teachers in differentiated small group instruction	Admin District level support personnel	Ongoing		Inservice records
	4c. Complete lesson study to assist teachers in developing solid lessons through collaboration and modeling.	Admin Classroom teachers	Ongoing		Inservice records
	4d. Provide ASP support for our struggling students in reading, math, science & writing	Administration Teachers	Ongoing	\$11,775	Attendance records
5. Need for more common formative assessments	5a. Create common formative assessments with grade level teams	Classroom teachers	Ongoing		Portfolio of grade level common formative assessments
	5b. Provide additional grade level teacher planning for development of grade level common formative assessments	Admin	ongoing	\$1000 per planning time	Portfolio of grade level common formative assessments

## EVALUATION - Outcome Measures and Reflection

**Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes:** *(Measures the level of implementation of the professional practices throughout the school)*

- Classroom Walk-throughs indicating daily groups being pulled.
- Use of vertical team for differentiation.
- Common Formative Assessments.
- Vertical team planning for differentiation.
- Plan books.
- Grade level team planning.
- Use of exit slip following vertical/grade level planning meetings

**Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations:** *(Measures of student achievement)*

- FCAT results
- Running Records
- FAIR
- Data Chart Wall
- Benchmark tests
- Data notebooks
- Thinking Maps
- Formative Assessments
- Student Led Conferences

**APPENDIX A**

(ALL SCHOOLS)

1.	Reading Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance <small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)</small>	2013 Expected Level of Performance <small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)</small>
<b>Anticipated Barrier(s):</b> <b>1. Lack of differentiated instruction</b>			
<b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1. Daily use of small groups for differentiation</b>			

<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at Achievement Level 3</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p>	<p>36% 146/403</p>	<p>39% 156/400</p>
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p>	<p>20% 2/10</p>	<p>25% 3/12</p>
<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b> differentiation, use of higher order thinking questioning</p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Daily small group with rigor 2. Use of higher order thinking/questioning 3. Vertical teaming</p>	<p>31% 125/403</p>	<p>36% 144/400</p>
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p>	<p>50% 5/10</p>	<p>58% 7/12</p>
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p>	<p>71% 5/7</p>	<p>80% 8/10</p>
<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b> Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p> <p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p>	<p>71% 55/77</p>	<p>75% 58/77</p>
<p><b>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</b></p> <p><b>Baseline data 2010-11:</b></p>	<p>68%</p>	<p>73%</p>
<p><b>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :</b></p> <p>White:</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for current level of performance</p> <p>30%</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance</p> <p>25%</p>



<u>Black</u> : <u>Hispanic</u> : <u>Asian</u> : <u>American Indian</u> :	63% 27% N/A N/A	58% 22% N/A N/A
<b>English Language Learners</b> (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading <b>Barrier(s):</b> <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.	75% 3/4	33% 1/3
<b>Students with Disabilities</b> (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading <b>Barrier(s):</b> <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.	47% 25/53	40% 26/66
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b> Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading <b>Barrier(s):</b> <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.	36% 68/190	30% 51/170

### Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Differentiated instruction	Monthly	Inservice records
Higher Order Thinking	Monthly	Inservice records

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Listening/ Speaking:</b> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">83%</div>			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Reading:</b> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">50%</div>	Materials	Implement use of Spotlight Learning Online within the classroom	Classroom Teacher  Reports run within the program
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Writing:</b> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">33%</div>	Not enough emphasis on instruction with	Training with faculty about teaching conventions within	Classroom Teachers Administrative

	conventions	the classroom	Walk Throughs
--	-------------	---------------	---------------

<b>1. Mathematics Goal(s):</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>
<b>Anticipated Barrier(s):</b> 1. Lack of differentiated instruction		
<b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Daily use of small group instruction for differentiation		
<b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 <b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.	36% 146/404	40% 160/400
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.	40% 4/10	50% 6/12
<b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s): differentiation</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. use of daily small group with rigor 2. implementation of Math Superstars	35% 143/404	38% 160/400
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.	30% 3/10	33% 4/12
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b>	100% 7/7	100% 10/10

<b>1.</b>		
<b>FCAT 2.0</b> Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b> <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1.</b>	79% 61/77	83% 64/77
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b> <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1.</b>	100%	100%
<b>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</b> <b>Baseline Data 2010-11:</b>	67%	73%
<b>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in math:</b>  <u>White:</u> → <u>Black:</u> → <u>Hispanic:</u> → <u>Asian:</u> → <u>American Indian:</u> →	28% 47% 30% N/A N/A	23% 42% 25% N/A N/A
<b>English Language Learners (ELL)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	0% 0/4	0% 0/3
<b>Students with Disabilities (SWD)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	24% 13/53	19% 10/53
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b> Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	23% 44/190	20% 34/170

### Mathematics Professional Development

<b>PD Content/Topic/Focus</b>	<b>Target Dates/Schedule</b>	<b>Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring</b>
Common Core	Ongoing	Inservice records Benchmark testing Lesson plans
"Do the Math" RtI Intervention	September 2012	Pre and post tests

<b>Writing</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>
<p><b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Not enough emphasis on conventions prior to 4<sup>th</sup> grade</b></p> <p><b>Not enough emphasis on higher level writing skills</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Train entire faculty during "Quality Curriculum" faculty meeting about writing requirements.</b></li> <li><b>2. Implement Melissa Forney and Nancy Prezito writing strategies</b></li> <li><b>3. Training from Theresa Phelps for entire faculty (October)</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b>FCAT:</b> Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing</p>	<p>72% 72/101</p>	<p>80% 80/100</p>
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing</p>	<p>0% 0/3</p>	<p>33% 1/3</p>

<b>Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle)</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>
<p><b>1.</b></p>		

<b>Barrier(s):</b> <b>Teacher read text/questions to students causing them not have that strategy during testing.</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1. Students will use think/pair/share strategy</b>		
<b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:	45% 45/100	53% 50/94
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	33% 1/3	33% 1/3
<b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	19% 19/100	26% 25/94
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science	67% 2/3	0%

***For the following areas, please write a brief narrative that includes the data for the year 2011-12 and a description of changes you intend to incorporate to improve the data for the year 2012-13.***

**MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI** (Identify the MTSS leadership team and its role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

The leadership team consists of: Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, Teachers, Response to Intervention Coach, Reading Coach, and School Psychologist.

The majority of members of the RtI leadership team were involved in developing the SIP. All teachers assisted in the disaggregating and analyzing of student achievement data from the previous year, not only to assist in the development of the School Improvement Plan, but also to allow them the opportunity to work in their Professional Learning Community to strengthen their skills.

To begin with, teachers analyze data from the previous year's FCAT to determine their strengths and weaknesses. They also analyze their present class FCAT data as a starting point to determine strengths and weaknesses of students.

Throughout the year A3 is used to monitor student growth as well as SRI, FAIR, RR, PASI, PSI, DAR. Common Formative Assessments developed by grade level teams are used during PLCs to review the results of student achievement, identify problem areas in which student performance did not meet anticipated proficiency levels, and develop plans to address those areas.

**PARENT INVOLVEMENT:**

In the 2011-2012 school year, we increased the number of parents completing the parent survey from 145 to 260 parents. We certainly were pleased to see the increase and we will continue to work on making it even higher this year.

Many parents volunteer at Enterprise. They attend our Quality Celebrations and classroom field trips, help with vision/hearing screenings, picture day and other big activities. They attend the "fun" activities.

However, when we look at educational interactions, such as parents attending Curriculum Night to learn how they can support their child's learning process by using teacher given methods, we do not have good attendance. As we analyzed Curriculum Night concerns brought by parents, we realize that parents often need to bring their child, so we will provide a movie night to provide a safe place for children to wait while their parent meets

with their teacher. Knowing parental involvement in academics is critical, we will also be looking at other ways to bring parents in. One way we will begin this year is with the implementation of Student Led Conferences. If parents are able to come in and have their student share how/what they are doing, we feel parents will be more apt to attend. At the beginning of last school year (2011-2012), we had about 44% of our families active on Edline. Our concern was that low number was not enabling parents to keep completely involved in their child's academics. By the end of the school year, we had increased that number to just over 50%. We are pleased that we are now sitting at 61% participation. We will continue the push to get parent accounts activated so that all parents can have current and precise information about their students' academic performance. This will also allow parents to receive timely email and newsletters to keep them informed about the happenings at Enterprise.

**ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)**

In the 2011/2012 school year, our average attendance rate was 96.49%. The first month of the 2012/2013 school year, we are at 97.37%. Teachers will be encouraged to call students each time they are absent, not only to find reason for absence, but also to encourage their students to attend school regularly. As students reach a concerning rate of absences, the school counselor will call parents and follow through with the attendance resource teacher as necessary.

**SUSPENSION:**

Suspension is not an issue here at Enterprise. As a Glasser Quality school, discipline is dealt with in a non-punitive way whenever possible. Discipline is done through a team approach, utilizing the administration, the school counselor and the teacher, as we use it as a learning experience. Of course, suspensions are used when necessary for non-negotiable safety issues.

**DROP-OUT (High Schools only):**

**POSTSECONDARY READINESS:** (How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful? Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.)

While our students are only elementary aged, we do want to give them an insight as to future plans. To fit in with current curriculum, teachers bring in guest speakers to discuss careers. Through weekly guidance lessons, our 6<sup>th</sup> grade students are learning time management skills, future career opportunities, availability of course work for their secondary transition, and learning styles.