

The School District of Palm Beach County

Calusa Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Calusa Elementary School

2051 CLINT MOORE RD, Boca Raton, FL 33496

<https://cale.palmbeachschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Susan Figueroa

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	30%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (80%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (77%) 2014-15: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Calusa Elementary School

2051 CLINT MOORE RD, Boca Raton, FL 33496

<https://cale.palmbeachschools.org>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">24%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">38%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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.

Mission

Calusa Elementary is committed to providing highly trained professional educators, partnering with parents and community to offer a world class education where the most innovating, researched based instructional practices are utilized: together we will ensure that each student has the opportunity to reach their highest potential, developing skills and ethics to become responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision

The Calusa Elementary School stakeholders believe that by establishing a climate of respect and responsibility within a framework of a solid academic program, our students will be prepared for the future.

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
Green, Lindsay	Teacher, ESE	Monitor student reading performance, Case Manager for SBT, interventions for low 25% and grade 3 readers.
Wotton, Christopher	Assistant Principal	Leadership, Observations, monitor performance, set goals, analyze data, low 25% interventions, parent communication
Gordon, Chari	Teacher, ESE	Monitor student performance, ESE coordinator, SBT & monitor interventions for low 25%
Rivelli-Schreiber, Dianne	Principal	Leadership, Observations, monitor performance, set goals, analyze data, low 25% interventions, parent communication
Thornberry, Carrie	School Counselor	Monitor student performance, SBT coordinator, School Counselor & monitor, 504, interventions for low 25%
Scharf, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Monitor student reading performance.
LeClair, Meryn	Teacher, K-12	Monitor student reading performance and interventions for low 25%.
Chirico, Brittanie	Teacher, K-12	Monitor student reading performance and interventions for low 25%.
Fisher, Charlie	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chairperson, Monitor student performance, interventions for low 25%
Griffith, Dana	Teacher, K-12	Monitor student reading performance, interventions for low 25% and grade 3 readers.
Morris, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Monitor student reading performance, interventions for low 25% and grade 4 readers.
Curra, GraceMarie	Teacher, K-12	Monitor student performance, interventions for low 25%
Burton, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	Monitor student performance, SBT coordinator, ESOL support & monitor, ACCESS, interventions for low 25%

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	218	193	192	200	218	207	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1228
Attendance below 90 percent	15	18	13	11	16	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	20	32	41	41	42	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	7	7	6	18	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

61

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/6/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	24	17	14	15	26	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	28	34	34	35	56	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	24	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	7	4	3	16	31	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	24	17	14	15	26	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	28	34	34	35	56	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	24	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	7	4	3	16	31	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	84%	58%	57%	81%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	80%	63%	58%	68%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	77%	56%	53%	57%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	88%	68%	63%	84%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	68%	62%	72%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%	59%	51%	67%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	79%	51%	53%	76%	51%	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	218 (0)	193 (0)	192 (0)	200 (0)	218 (0)	207 (0)	1228 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	15 (24)	18 (17)	13 (14)	11 (15)	16 (26)	27 (20)	100 (116)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)	4 (3)	7 (3)	5 (3)	19 (10)
Course failure in ELA or Math	20 (28)	32 (34)	41 (34)	41 (35)	42 (56)	38 (33)	214 (220)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	17 (16)	18 (24)	21 (14)	56 (54)

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	77%	54%	23%	58%	19%
	2018	83%	56%	27%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	62%	23%	58%	27%
	2018	79%	58%	21%	56%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	85%	59%	26%	56%	29%
	2018	84%	59%	25%	55%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	85%	65%	20%	62%	23%
	2018	82%	63%	19%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	67%	16%	64%	19%
	2018	79%	63%	16%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	88%	65%	23%	60%	28%
	2018	87%	66%	21%	61%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	78%	51%	27%	53%	25%
	2018	78%	56%	22%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	60	67	62	57	61	55	50				

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
ELL	77	86	82	86	80	79	77				
ASN	100	87		96	87						
BLK	52	78		73	79	77					
HSP	81	84	79	89	76	72	90				
MUL	87	83		81	72		85				
WHT	87	77	71	89	79	70	75				
FRL	76	80	84	80	77	68	75				
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	65	61	60	70	70	63	76				
ELL	70	68	78	78	73	67	63				
ASN	96	90		96	90						
BLK	70	71		64	50						
HSP	83	72	69	83	82	73	84				
MUL	87	56		91	81						
WHT	84	72	69	87	73	65	80				
FRL	77	75	74	75	73	69	71				
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	57	47	36	54	50	43	42				
ELL	55	71	69	64	71	68					
ASN	91	86		100	86						
BLK	69	53		66	84						
HSP	77	67	63	83	70	64	74				
MUL	89	80		95	80						
WHT	83	69	56	85	71	65	76				
FRL	73	59	58	77	69	59	60				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	81
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	90
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	647

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	60
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	82
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	93
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	72
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	82
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	82
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	80
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	78
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.

Math Low 25% (grades 4/5) scored 72% which was an increase of 7% points from 2018. However this is still our lowest performing components as part of School Grade. SWD for ELA scored 61%, Math 58%, and Science 52%. Black/African American students in ELA scored 52%. These are the lowest subgroups on FSA reporting data. While these are our lowest, we are still trending higher than District & State causing us to constantly monitor the progress of these specific subgroups. Contributing factors to the lower performance could have been related to absenteeism, tardies, and not attending our after-school tutorial programs. As a trend, we are also seeing that students are exposed to grade level materials and text, but it will take a few years to continue to close that gap as we instruct them on strategies to tackle the complex text for their grade level.

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

Science NGSSS declined 2% from 2018 to 2019. Some of the possible factors contributing to this decline could include: new science series, new resources, placement of the NGSSS at the end of all state-wide assessment (two days following two days of math assessment), students needing remediation in science who also needed reading and math remediation encountered time constraints in our daily schedule.

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.

All components were above the District and State averages. The component that needs close monitoring for continued growth is math low 25%.

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

ELA in 4th & 5th grade increased by 8% from 2018 to 2019 as well as the low 25% ELA increased by 7% and low 25% math increased by 7%. New action that was taken in FY19 was the implementation of Morning AND Afternoon tutorial sessions for students in 4th & 5th grade.

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

We continue to notice that attendance is improving, but it is pertinent to monitor individual student attendance. Continue the PBCSD attendance program, in-school work with School Counselor to monitor truancy, and individual teachers reaching out to parents/guardians about the effect of absences on academic performance.

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

1. Math Low 25% (4th & 5th grade) to increase 6% on the FSA in 2020
2. Reading (3rd grade) to increase 5% on the FSA in 2020
3. Science (5th grade) to increase 4% on the FSA in 2020
4. Math overall (3rd-5th) to increase 3% on the FSA in 2020

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase reading proficiency to ensure high school readiness
Rationale	To support the District's Strategic Plan of increasing student proficiency in 3rd grade as well as ensuring high school readiness (4th & 5th grade).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase 3rd grade reading proficiency by 5% to 89% on the FSA ELA in 2020 and low 25% ELA in 4th & 5th grade to 78% on the FSA ELA (& writing) in 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dianne Rivelli-Schreiber (dianne.rivelli-schreiber@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data Tracking through technology (Performance Matters, LSI Standards Tracker, iReady) 2. Data Tracking on attendance in Tutorial (AM and PM) 3. Data Tracking through weekly SBT monitoring meetings
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Data-based via various sources of student performance based on long, mid, and short data points. Using the data to have teachers focus on specific benchmarks in tutorial, small groups, iReady toolkit, and assigned extra iReady lessons.
Action Step	
Description	<p>Strategy: Adaptive Technology Rationale: Technology will afford students the opportunity for remediation and enrichment through interaction with the content. Action Steps: Adaptive Technology</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure teachers are trained to use PM, LSI and iReady. 2. Teachers develop a rotational schedule to ensure all students have equitable access to the technology programs. 3. Teachers will review and analyze data to make revisions on content focus during small group instruction. 4. Monitoring will occur through data analysis, administrative classroom walks and data tracking of student progress by the Leadership Team & Dianne Rivelli-Schreiber (principal) <p>Strategy: Tutorial Rationale: Students are provided with additional standards-based lessons before and/or after school Action Steps: Tutorial</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify teachers for tutorial programs 2. Teachers identify students for direct instruction and/or technology lab 3. Teachers instruct using standards-based lessons targeted towards FSA item specs 4. Monitoring will occur through data analysis, administrative classroom walks and data tracking of student progress by the Leadership Team & Dianne Rivelli-Schreiber (principal) <p>Strategy: School Based Team (SBT) Rationale: Students identified through SBT are monitored for implementation & fidelity of interventions Action Steps: SBT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers & Case Managers are notified of students on SBT List 2. SBT Leaders share process of Rtl at Faculty Meeting

3. Weekly meetings are used to monitor student data, progress, interventions, and movement in Rti process.
4. Monitoring will occur through data analysis, administrative classroom walks and data tracking of student progress by the Leadership Team & Dianne Rivelli-Schreiber (principal)

Person Responsible

Dianne Rivelli-Schreiber (dianne.rivelli-schreiber@palmbeachschools.org)

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).

Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous task encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 with a focus on reading and writing across all content areas. At Calusa, students will focus on these content related topics listed below during a 6-day rotation for 30-minutes at a time using literature, discussions, age-appropriate resources and/or videos.

Our students focus on content and curriculum related to:

The History of the Holocaust

The History of Black and African Americans

The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics

The Contributions of Women

The Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols, and monitoring SwPBS through data. In alignment, to school board 2.09 and Florida State statute 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to in music our students study music of different eras and countries and in media our library selection is filled with books related to the variety of cultures. Students build aspects of Social Emotional learning (SEL) while participating in Academic Teaming on components including: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and decision making.

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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: Increase reading proficiency to ensure high school readiness				\$4,247.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	1911 - Calusa Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	61.0	\$4,247.00
Total:						\$4,247.00