Park Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Park Elementary School

327 E PALMETTO ST, Avon Park, FL 33825

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~pes/

Demographics

Principal: Robert Germaine

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (42%) 2014-15: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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

Park Elementary School

327 E PALMETTO ST, Avon Park, FL 33825

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~pes/

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	85%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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.

Park Elementary's mission statement is: "Purposely Empowering Success."

Provide the school's vision statement.

Park Elementary's vision statement is: "Go Near and Far Leading Wherever You Are."

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
Conner, Carey	Principal	
Free, Stacie	Teacher, PreK	
Rodriguez, LaCae	Instructional Coach	
Pantoja, Maricarmen	Instructional Coach	
Laye, Summer	Instructional Technology	
Barbour, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Messer, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Jahna, Adriana	Teacher, K-12	
Hendrick-Robles, Nikki	Teacher, K-12	
Brown, Krystal	Teacher, K-12	
Richards, Alisha	Teacher, K-12	
McGee, Nikki	Teacher, K-12	
Germaine, Robert	Assistant Principal	

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	82	79	78	83	64	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460
Attendance below 90 percent	9	15	7	11	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	1	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	34	12	20	11	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	16	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	3	13	3	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	11	7	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

25

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/22/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	7	7	7	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	7	4	1	6	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	51	19	18	16	10	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	36	50	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141

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	5	0	1	10	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	14	7	7	7	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	7	4	1	6	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	51	19	18	16	10	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	36	50	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141

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	5	0	1	10	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	51%	50%	57%	43%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	54%	58%	47%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	49%	53%	51%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	58%	57%	63%	55%	59%	61%
Math Learning Gains	47%	57%	62%	48%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%	44%	51%	47%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	45%	53%	52%	47%	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	82 (0)	79 (0)	78 (0)	83 (0)	64 (0)	74 (0)	460 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	9 (14)	15 (7)	7 (7)	11 (7)	13 (8)	13 (5)	68 (48)
One or more suspensions	1 (7)	4 (4)	4 (1)	1 (6)	5 (4)	9 (8)	24 (30)
Course failure in ELA or Math	34 (51)	12 (19)	20 (18)	11 (16)	18 (10)	10 (34)	105 (148)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (36)	16 (50)	27 (55)	44 (141)

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	53%	50%	3%	58%	-5%
	2018	45%	48%	-3%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	49%	4%	58%	-5%
	2018	43%	45%	-2%	56%	-13%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	44%	45%	-1%	56%	-12%
	2018	38%	47%	-9%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	56%	17%	62%	11%
	2018	57%	61%	-4%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	60%	0%	64%	-4%
	2018	42%	53%	-11%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	43%	49%	-6%	60%	-17%
	2018	38%	52%	-14%	61%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	43%	-8%	53%	-18%
	2018	45%	50%	-5%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	30	32	29	37	29	11				
ELL	40	40		65	47						
BLK	38	60		37	34	17	25				
HSP	49	58	56	58	47	29	30				
MUL	64			64	55						
WHT	56	62	50	68	56		39				
FRL	45	59	51	53	44	28	31				

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	9	15	13	14	18	17	9				
ELL	24	44		34	31						
BLK	33	29		33	43						
HSP	37	48	57	43	40	32	38				
WHT	53	47		59	47	27	60				
FRL	39	42	41	44	40	36	41				

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	13	38	46	23	42	33					
ELL	23	39	54	54	68	60					
BLK	28	40		44	47		18				
HSP	40	43	48	52	50	50	50				
WHT	49	53		61	47		73				
FRL	38	46	51	50	49	48	42				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 data component that showed the lowest performance is the Math Lowest 25th Percentile with only 27% percent of the students making learning gains. Science performance was also low, with only 33% demonstrating proficiency.

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 is Science, with a decrease of 12%.
18-19 45% proficient
19-20 33% proficient

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the Math Lowest 25th Percentile:
PES 27%; State 51% (24% gap)

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 ELA Gains. In 2017-2018 44% of the students made gains in ELA, while in 2018-2019 61% of the students made learning gains. (17% increase)
Teachers met weekly in Professional Learning Communities to plan effective instruction, analyze data, and share instructional strategies. After analyzing previous year's FSA data, students were grouped based on their needs and provided with targeted interventions.

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

Last year in third grade there were 13 students that had 2 or more EWS indicators. We will monitor those students closely to be sure we have the appropriate supports and interventions in place.

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

1. Math learning gains for the lowest 25%
2. Science Proficiency
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math
Rationale	Based on school grade data from FSA Math Proficiency has improved from 2018 to 2019 (47% to 58%) , but Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed a decrease from 35% to 27%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	60% of the students will be proficient on Math FSA by May 2020. 35% of the students in the Lowest 25th Percentile will make learning gains on the Math FSA by May 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Maricarmen Pantoja (pantojam@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Targeted intervention groups
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The previous year's FSA data in the lowest 25th percentile showed an 8% decline. This data was used to identify the students that were in the lowest 25th percentile. Intervention groups were determined using FSA IReady Diagnostic 1 data.
Action Step	
Description	1. Continued implementation of Math PLC model. 2. FSA Data from 18-19 will be used to target students for small group instruction to achieve proficiency and learning gains. 3. Students identified in the lowest 25th percentile will receive explicit, small group instruction. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Carey Conner (connerc@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Science
Rationale	Science proficiency declined from 45% proficient in 17-18 to 33% proficient in 18-19. This was below the district and state average.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	41% of the 5th grade students will achieve proficiency on the state assessment in May 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carey Conner (connerc@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use of Instructional Practice Guide to plan effective lessons
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Science statewide assessment data showed a 12% decline from the previous year.
Action Step	
Description	1. Monthly PLC meetings in 5th 2. Use of Science Instructional Practice Guide to plan effective lessons 3. Classroom walk-throughs to monitor effective instruction 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Carey Conner (connerc@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Subgroup Performance
Rationale	According to the Federal Index Report, two subgroups scored below 41% proficient. African American 33% Students with Disabilities 27%
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	African American students will increase their proficiency rate to 41% in ELA and Math on the May FSA. Students with Disabilities will increase their proficiency rate to 41% in ELA and Math on the May FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carey Conner (connerc@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Previous year's FSA data indicated that two subgroups did not meet 41% proficiency in ELA and Math. (African American Students and Students with Disabiities) This indicated that the need for further data analysis.
Action Step	
Description	1. Analyzed individual student data to determine the amounts of points necessary to make a learning gain. 2. Identified students scoring in the lowest 25th percentile in ELA and Math. 3. Analyzed IReady Diagnostic data in ELA and Math. 4. Developed intervention groups in ELA and Math based on all available data.
Person Responsible	Carey Conner (connerc@highlands.k12.fl.us)

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).

Based on school grade data from FSA, ELA showed increases in proficiency learning gains. Though we met or exceeded district averages, we were still below the state average. As a result, we will use our previous year's FSA data and data from IReady Diagnostic 1 to determine intervention groups.

FSA data from 18-19 also indicated that two of our sub-populations scored below 41% proficient. (Students with disabilities were 27% proficient and our African American students were 35% proficient) In order to address these areas we have taken the following actions:
1. Analyzed individual student data to determine the amounts of points necessary to make a learning gain.
2. Identified students scoring in the lowest 25th percentile in ELA and Math.
3. Analyzed IReady Diagnostic data in ELA and Math.
4. Developed intervention groups in ELA and Math based on all available data.

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, Â§ 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.

Park Elementary provides several avenues for parents to be involved with our school. Listed below are several activities we provide in order us to build positive relationships, as well as keep parent informed of their child's academic progress.

Back to School Orientation: August 6, 2019
PTO/SAC Meetings:
Automated Phone System: August 2019-May 2020
School Newsletters/Website: Monthly
MTSS Meetings: August 2019-May 2020
Parent Conference Night: October 2019
Family Movie Night: January 2020
Jingle Bell Run: December 2019
Parent Conference Night: April 2020
Teacher Websites: On going SY 2019-2020
Awards Day: Oct. 2019, Dec. 2019, March 2020, May 2020
5th Grade Celebration: May 2020
1st Grade Turkey Trot: November 2019
Thanksgiving Meal: November 2019
Holiday Meal: December 2019
Pre-K Parent End of Year Celebration & Awards: May 2020

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.

Park Elementary ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met by providing monthly class meetings focused on social-emotional skills, providing a Bullying Box to allow for anonymous reporting of Bullying, and a buddy class system for the purpose of mentoring. We also implement Check In/Check Out systems for students who utilize point sheets for daily one-on-one adult contact.

Students are referred to Guidance Counselor, Mental Health Therapist or Social Worker for counseling needs. She provides counseling or connects families to community services such as the Children's Advocacy Center as an additional resources.

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

Park Elementary provides a Pre-K Migrant program that provides services to 3 - 4 year old children. The Migrant liaison assists families in registering and obtaining information concerning entrance into Kindergarten. The Handicap Pre-K classrooms also provide services to 3 - 4 year old children. Staffing Specialists assists these families in obtaining information concerning entrance into Kindergarten.

In May, our Guidance Counselor collaborates with the Avon Park Middle School Guidance Counselor to discuss the outgoing 5th grade cohort. Fifth grade students also visit the school in May in order to become familiar with the campus. Avon Park Middle School discusses school wide expectations, extracurricular activities and options for electives during this visit.

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.

In order to address the effectiveness of our core instruction, the MTSS team meets regularly to discuss academic growth of students individually/make instructional decisions. Members meet more frequently to discuss individual student needs (Tier 3). Teachers, Instructional Coaches and Administration meet to discuss small group instruction and the effectiveness of interventions taking place in the classroom.

Title I, Part A will provide funds to all district Title 1 schools, in a school wide project format, to target academic assistance to all students, professional development for teachers and parent involvement activities. .

Title I, Part C Migrant will provide services to migrant students (PreK-12) and their families. The primary goal of the Migrant program is to improve academic performance of migrant students, provide health/ guidance to them. The Migrant Early Childhood Program serves 4 year old children in a full time preschool program, focusing on readiness activities. Parent involvement/education is an integral part of the Migrant Program.

Title II provides teacher professional development/supports all teachers/paraprofessionals to be highly qualified.

Title III supports activities to assist students becoming proficient in English, supports teacher professional development in ELL strategies/parent involvement/education.

Title VI, Part B provides for our Career Academy at SFSC giving students vocational opportunities and academic education.

Title X Homeless provides resources (school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as

homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free/appropriate education (FAPE).

Nutrition Programs provide federal Free/Reduced lunch programs/free breakfast for all students. Snack is also provided for after school care/after school tutoring programs. Summer food programs are provided at various school sites/community locations.

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Subgroup Performance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00