

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Information | 4 |
| Needs Assessment | 7 |
| Planning for Improvement | 10 |
| Title I Requirements | 11 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 13 |

| | | Parker Elementary School | | |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|
| | Par | ker Elementary Sch | ool | |
| | 640 S HI | GHWAY 22 A, Panama City, F | FL 32404 | |
| | | [no web address on file] | | |
| School Demographics | | | | |
| School Type and Grad (per MSID File | | 2017-18 Title I School | Disadvan | B Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
| Elementary Sch PK-5 | ool | Yes | | 88% |
| Primary Service (per MSID File | | Charter School | (Reporte | 9 Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Edu | cation | No | | 52% |
| School Grades History | | | | |
| Year Grade | 2017-18 В | 2016-17 C | 2015-16 C | 2014-15 D* |
| School Board Approva | I | | | |

This plan is pending approval by the Bay 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.

Parker Elementary School (PES) seeks to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success of all students through developmentally appropriate instruction that acknowledges individual differences and learning styles.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of all Parker Elementary School stakeholders is to meet the needs of all students by granting them diverse educational opportunities by means of:

- Instruction designed to prepare students for mastery of Florida State Standards.
- Learning that develops skills for students to improve in language arts, mathematics, and school safety.
- Opportunities to exhibit responsibilities and promote self-esteem.
- Teamwork to become productive citizens.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| Coan, Christopher | Principal |
| Barron, Christen | Assistant Principal |
| Hurst, Elizabeth | Teacher, ESE |
| Turner, Ruth | Teacher, K-12 |
| McGee, Marian | Teacher, K-12 |
| Bailey, Ashlie | Teacher, K-12 |
| Hitzeman, Isabelle | School Counselor |
| Sapp, Minnie | Teacher, K-12 |
| Vance, Kelly | Teacher, ESE |
| Wolff, Bethany | School Counselor |
| Marcino, Patricia | Teacher, K-12 |
| Scurlock, Amanda | Instructional Coach |
| Henson, Teresa | Teacher, ESE |
| Robinson, Michelle | Teacher, K-12 |

Duties

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

Principal (Christopher Coan): Fosters a unified vision of data-driven decision making, serves as the instructional leader of the school, ensures that the school-based teams (School/MTSS Leadership and Grade Level PLC's) are implementing MTSS as well as standards-based lesson planning with common assessments, assesses MTSS skills of school staff, facilitates implementation of intervention

support and documentation, secures adequate professional development to support teacher need, and communicates school vision and mission to stakeholders.

Administrative Assistant (Christen Barron): Serves as PES PBS Coach, assists principal in creating a unified vision of data-driven decision making, ensures that school - based teams (School/MTSS Leadership and Grade Level PLC's) are implementing MTSS, assesses MTSS skills of school staff, facilitates implementation of intervention support and documentation, secures adequate professional development, designs paraprofessional support schedule to support MTSS implementation and core programs, and communicates school vision and mission to stakeholders.

Grade Level Representative Teachers (Ruth Turner, Darlene McGee, Ashlie Bailey, Cynthia Williams Patricia Marcino, and Michelle Robinson) shares information about core instruction, leads their grade-level

with common assessment creation and data-driven dialogue, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/interventions, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2 and Tier 3 activities, leads Grade Level PLC's in the analysis of student response to instruction and helps teachers design intervention adjustments for students.

Student Services Interventionist (Elizabeth Hurst): Serves as part of PES's PBS team by assisting with behavior management of students in crisis and providing Tier I Behavior Training to teachers. Additionally, assists School/MTSS Leadership Team and teachers in behavioral observation training, performs observations of students, assesses student behaviors, and provides support in the creation of behavioral intervention plans after working with teacher to adjust Tier 1 Core instruction. The Interventionist leads MTSS grade level teams during monthly MTSS grade level meetings and provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students and continues to match child-serving and community agencies to the school and families to support student's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

Speech/Language Pathologists: Educates the PLC teams in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction as a platform for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of measures; help identify systemic patterns of students' needs with respect to language skills; and suggest intervention strategies aligned to students' needs as well as assists teachers in analyzing ongoing progress monitoring data.

School Psychologist participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; supports intervention documentation for fidelity; and participates in student problem solving meetings with Tier 3 students families.

Guidance Counselors (Isabelle Hitzman and Bethany Wolfe): Leads MTSS grade level teams during monthly MTSS grade level meetings and provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students and continue to match child-serving and community agencies to the school and families to support student's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success, utilize Enrich for MTSS to view school status of MTSS implementation.

Instructional Coaches assist in lesson preparation and execution in ELA and MATH. They are a regular part of grade level PLC's and data chats with teachers.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

| Indicator | | | | | Gr | ade | Le | vel | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|-----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 27 | 22 | 21 | 27 | 12 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 3 | 5 | 15 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 4 | 19 | 12 | 12 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 14 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|---|-------------|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 1 | 5 | 8 | 24 | 13 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 5 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 1 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |

Date this data was collected

Friday 7/20/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

| la diastan | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 | 17 | 24 | 11 | 18 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 39 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |
| | 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 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | | | | | (| Grac | le L | .ev | el | | | | | Total |
|--|---|---|---|----|----|------|------|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 1 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

| Indiastar | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 | 17 | 24 | 11 | 18 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 39 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |
| | 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 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|---|-------------|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | Κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 1 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |

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?

Achievement in ELA (46%) and Mathematics (43%). Yes, the achievement percentages have been the lowest since the inception of FSA even though this was the highest compared to the previous three years.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The greatest decline was the lowest quartile in ELA. The students in that subgroup declined from 2016 - 2017. While the percentage is above 50% it is still less than the prior year or the overall learning gains.

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

Mathematics Achievement had the largest gap to the state average. The school average was 43% compared to 62% for the state average.

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

The growth in mathematics learning gains is a trend in the positive direction with the implementation of Eureka Math and the longer math block with a direct and structured curriculum.

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

The ability for the teachers to have a directly aligned curriculum to the standards with rigorous outcomes, plus circular teaching with constant reteaching and revisiting of prior standards while implementing new content.

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 Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 46% | 50% | 56% | 39% | 48% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 62% | 49% | 55% | 52% | 47% | 52% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 53% | 45% | 48% | 55% | 43% | 46% |
| Math Achievement | 43% | 57% | 62% | 46% | 53% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 58% | 57% | 59% | 53% | 53% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 61% | 46% | 47% | 55% | 43% | 46% |
| Science Achievement | 54% | 50% | 55% | 31% | 44% | 51% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey |
|---|
|---|

| Indicator | | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|--|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 27 (20) | 22 (17) | 21 (24) | 27 (11) | 12 (18) | 18 (19) | 127 (109) | | |
| One or more suspensions | 3 (1) | 3 (4) | 5 (8) | 15 (5) | 4 (3) | 11 (4) | 41 (25) | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (2) | 4 (2) | 19 (7) | 12 (12) | 12 (9) | 27 (8) | 74 (40) | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 44 (26) | 14 (39) | 27 (41) | 85 (106) | | |

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 | 39% | 57% | -18% | 57% | -18% | | | |
| | 2017 | 39% | 59% | -20% | 58% | -19% | | | |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison | | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 50% | 51% | -1% | 56% | -6% | | | |
| | 2017 | 36% | 52% | -16% | 56% | -20% | | | |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 14% | | | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|-------------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School District Distric | | | | School- State Comparison | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 11% | | | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 53% | 50% | 3% | 55% | -2% | | |
| | 2017 | 42% | 49% | -7% | 53% | -11% | | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 17% | | | | | | |

| | MATH | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | |
| 03 | 2018 | 38% | 63% | -25% | 62% | -24% | | | |
| | 2017 | 35% | 56% | -21% | 62% | -27% | | | |
| Same Grade Co | omparison | 3% | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comp | parison | | | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 56% | 59% | -3% | 62% | -6% | | | |
| | 2017 | 56% | 62% | -6% | 64% | -8% | | | |
| Same Grade Co | omparison | 0% | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comp | parison | 21% | | | | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 43% | 57% | -14% | 61% | -18% | | | |
| | 2017 | 31% | 52% | -21% | 57% | -26% | | | |
| Same Grade Co | omparison | 12% | | | • | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -13% | | | | | | | |

| | | | SCIEN | CE | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 05 | 2018 | 55% | 54% | 1% | 55% | 0% |
| | 2017 | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | iparison | | | | | |

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 | 26 | 48 | 44 | 25 | 49 | 59 | 45 | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 53 | | 31 | 50 | | 30 | | | | |
| HSP | 76 | 70 | | 71 | 70 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 61 | | | 44 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | 61 | 55 | 42 | 56 | 62 | 64 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 57 | 56 | 35 | 55 | 68 | 55 | | | | |

| | 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 | 23 | 58 | 57 | 29 | 41 | 39 | 15 | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | 59 | 69 | 23 | 39 | 35 | 35 | | | | |
| HSP | 58 | 67 | | 54 | 58 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 38 | 80 | | 43 | 45 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | 58 | 65 | 47 | 49 | 50 | 38 | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 59 | 64 | 38 | 46 | 44 | 36 | | | | |

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:

| Activity #4 | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Activity #1 | |
| Title | Increase Student Proficiency in ELA and Math |
| Rationale | Increase student proficiency and learning gains in ELA and math by building capacity of all stakeholders through collaborative professional learning communities that focus on student achievement data to make instructional decisions. |
| Intended Outcome | ELA Proficiency on 2018 - 2019 FSA will increase from 46% to 51%. Mathematics Proficiency on 2018 - 2018 FSA will increase from 43% to 47%. |
| Point Person | Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | Paraprofessionals will provide small group instruction in reading and math. Provide supplemental readers to students specifically non-fiction text in science and social science as well as supplies for teacher PLC's. Students provided the resources for a high engaging classroom environment. |
| Person Responsible | Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Plan to Monito | or Effectiveness |
| Description | Para schedules will be monitored as well as individual classroom data. Lesson plans and common assessment data will be analyzed. Administration will ensure the proper use of materials and supplies in CWT's. |
| Person Responsible | Christen Barron (barrocl@bay.k12.fl.us) |

| Activity #2 | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Title | Decrease the amount of lost instructional time due to behavioral incidents. |
| Rationale | The decreasing amount of Office Discipline Referrals will result in additional high quality instruction in ELA and Mathematics in the regular classroom environment. |
| Intended Outcome | To reduce the number of referrals from 340 in 2017-2018 to 275 in the 2018 - 2019 school year. |
| Point Person | Christen Barron (barrocl@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | Increase teacher / student relationships Improve Tier 1 Intervention Increase social skills curriculum for Tier 2/3 students |
| Person Responsible | BethAnn Hurst (hurstea@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Plan to Monito | or Effectiveness |
| Description | Implementation of the Peace First Curriculum School Wide DOJO Focused schedule of small group / social skills groups and intervention |
| Person Responsible | Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.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.

The school will host many parent involvement events looking at the various components of the school environment. Additionally the school uses school wide dojo, where every teacher and every parent in invited to participate in communication using dojo. Newsletter and additional flyers regarding the students education are sent electronically and in paper form.

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.

The social-emotional needs of students are being met at PES through a school-wide PBS implementation as well as active tier 2 and tier 3 behavior plans. Students on a Tier 2 or Tier 3 behavior plan are receiving social skill lessons in small groups. PES also employs two certified Guidance Counselors as well as one Intervention Specialist to aid students. PES also has a mentoring program with various community representatives and area churches that provide mentors to students. PES uses

our guidance counselors to provide small group counseling sessions and behavior intervention supports to teachers.

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

At Parker Elementary School, all students in the pre-kindergarten program are assessed prior to exiting in order to check for mastery of the Florida Early Learning and Developmental Standards for Four Year Olds. Each child is given the Florida Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK) assessment three times during the school year. These tests correlate with the Florida VPK standards and show any developmental growth throughout the school year. All pre-kindergarten students are taught and evaluated on the following areas:

*Physical Health *Approaches to Learning *Social and Emotional *Language and Communication *Emergent Literacy *Mathematical and Scientific Learning *Social Studies *Motor Development

All evaluations are documented and kept in a student's cumulative file.

As for Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Pre-Kindergarten students, they are assessed twice yearly using the Brigance Inventory of Early Development. This test is designed to evaluate students in the areas of literacy and math skills.

All incoming kindergarten students are assessed in order to determine individual and group needs. The Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS) is given within the first thirty days of school to assess the readiness of each incoming kindergarten student as well as the Number Sense Screener.

All 5th grade students attend a transition day at Everitt Middle School in the spring. Everitt also attends many PES functions and provides information to parents concerning academics and clubs.

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 School/MTSS Leadership Team reviewed all school data in the summer of 2017; emphasizing the use of data-driven dialogue. Areas of special interest were math, attendance, and behavior data. To address math needs, the school is implementing Eureka. Teachers will follow pacing guides developed by the district in all subject areas. To address behavior and attendance needs, teachers will continue to use the "Peace First" social skills curriculum. Weekly/Monthly attendance incentives will also be used.

Title 1 dollars have been allocated to retain a Behavior Intervention Specialist for the 2018/19 school year. This interventionist is instrumental in assisting teachers with classroom management and student behavior interventions. Other duties include scheduling and providing interventions for MTSS Tier 3 academic and behavior.

PES will continue use of SRA Signature Series as the core reading instruction. Title 1 monies have been used to purchase additional paraprofessionals for every classroom during the reading block to facilitate

small groups for all students.

Parker Elementary School Leadership Team meets monthly to review school-wide data to identify students in need of core, supplemental, and intervention instruction. MAP data and common summative assessments in reading and math will be used to determine the effectiveness of the school plan compared to other schools.

All faculty and staff will participate in an interactive book study, "Move your Bus" to be discussed during an on-line discussion forum.

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 | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Total: | \$390,852.00 | | | | | |