Sandpiper Shores Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sandpiper Shores Elementary School

11201 GLADES RD, Boca Raton, FL 33498

https://sses.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Monique Coyle

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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)	53%
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 (70%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (68%)
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

Sandpiper Shores Elementary School

11201 GLADES RD, Boca Raton, FL 33498

https://sses.palmbeachschools.org

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	No	43%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

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

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.

Sandpiper Shores Elementary is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sandpiper Shores Elementary envisions a dynamic collaborative multi-cultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

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
Coletto, Stephanie	Principal	The leadership team meets bimonthly to discuss student data and pending rti and SBT progress. We strive to create a single school culture of data driven decisions to guide and support our teams. The leadership team discusses trends in the school and outside community. The leadership team discusses problems in the operation and in function and brainstorms solutions to develop purposeful, personalized support to ensure all students learn. The guidance counselors run a mentoring program. they do social emotional learning groups. Ms. Rice runs our RTI and Ms. Brant is in charge of ESE and runs our School-based team. Our School Behavioral Heath =oversees and counsels students in need.
Boone, Sheila	Assistant Principal	All scheduling, discipline, safety, curriculum monitoring, Transportation, non instructional supervision
Brandt, Renee	Teacher, ESE	Scheduling for ESE students, IEP Meetings, Teacher liason, LEA, School based Team Leader, ASD support
Rice, Traci	Teacher, K-12	SAI Teacher, Interventionist, MTSS Leader, Scheduling of the low 25%
Brodbeck, Alison	Psychologist	School Psychologist, Evaluations of students who have been through the RTI Process, meetings with parents
Lessne, Dahlia	School Counselor	School counselor, school success groups, mentoring program, SEL Leader
Anderson, Luisa	School Counselor	ESOL School counselor, school success groups, parent liason, Swpbs Leader

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	127	118	119	152	145	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	816
Attendance below 90 percent	27	16	13	13	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	58	53	50	62	41	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	312
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	24	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	19	11	5	26	27	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	1	1	2	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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)
43

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 7/22/2019

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	20	12	19	27	28	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	37	38	58	68	51	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	30	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	12	6	6	34	31	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118

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	20	12	19	27	28	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	37	38	58	68	51	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	30	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	12	6	6	34	31	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118

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	77%	58%	57%	74%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	73%	63%	58%	70%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	56%	53%	61%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	76%	68%	63%	75%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	68%	62%	62%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	59%	51%	44%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	51%	53%	66%	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	127 (0)	118 (0)	119 (0)	152 (0)	145 (0)	155 (0)	816 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	27 (20)	16 (12)	13 (19)	13 (27)	21 (28)	17 (18)	107 (124)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)	0 (1)	2 (4)	1 (2)	5 (8)
Course failure in ELA or Math	58 (37)	53 (38)	50 (58)	62 (68)	41 (51)	48 (68)	312 (320)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	24 (30)	24 (30)	37 (20)	85 (80)

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	73%	54%	19%	58%	15%
	2018	72%	56%	16%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	62%	14%	58%	18%
	2018	71%	58%	13%	56%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	69%	59%	10%	56%	13%
	2018	74%	59%	15%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	72%	65%	7%	62%	10%
	2018	74%	63%	11%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	67%	10%	64%	13%
	2018	67%	63%	4%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	68%	65%	3%	60%	8%
	2018	78%	66%	12%	61%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	51%	8%	53%	6%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	54	64	61	48	61	57	38				
ELL	64	70	68	63	77	67	57				
ASN	80			87							
BLK	48	63		52	53		62				
HSP	76	69	55	74	73	61	65				
MUL	86			93							
WHT	81	78	73	80	78	61	69				
FRL	65	65	53	66	69	63	54				

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	42	59	59	44	55	45	41				
ELL	67	89	84	61	71	62	68				
ASN	80	60		80	70						
BLK	69	71	64	63	81	80	43				
HSP	74	80	80	74	70	53	70				
MUL	67			89							
WHT	76	75	56	75	69	48	66				
FRL	69	76	69	65	65	53	58				

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	36	57	59	44	47	50	30				
ELL	45	59	58	60	69	50	33				
ASN	67	83		80	67						
BLK	48	85	83	52	40	50					
HSP	71	69	65	73	62	53	66				
MUL	60			90							
WHT	82	69	47	80	65	33	78				
FRL	63	63	60	65	62	51	50				

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	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	572
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
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	69
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	84
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	56
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	70
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	90
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	74
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	64
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.

ELA Learning gains of the Lowest 25% among grades 4 and 5 was at 60%. This is down 12% from FY18.
Science achievement was 59% This is down 6% from FY18. Science performance is consistently low showing a trend in our school.

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

Grade 4 and 5 Learning gains showed the greatest decline. Learning gains of the Lowest 25% went down 12% from FY18.

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.

ELA Achievement showed the biggest gap. The state average was 57% and the school average was 77%. The gap was 20%

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

Math Learning gains of the lowest 25% percent showed the most Improvement increasing from 54% to 62%. This is a trend. This area has increase over the last 4 years.

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

Students in grade 3,4,5 with 2 or more EWS indicators are 25% or above.
Students missing 10% or more of school days is reflective in their data results.

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

1. ELA achievement in 3rd grade has been stagnant ant 72% for 4 years.
2. Math achievement in 3rd grade has been stagnant at 72% for 4 years
3. Science has been low for 5 years. We decreased by 6% in achievement in FY19
4. Learning gains of the Lowest 25% decreased by 12% in FY19

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	If we deliver differentiated, rigorous standards-based instruction in 3rd grade, then we will increase reading proficiency by 5%. From 73% to 78%.
Rationale	Through data analysis, we determined that our third grade achievement level has been stagnant for 4 years. Although we went up 1% in FY 19 we have not made significant gains to align with the strategic plan goal. By focusing on this area we will increase student achievement and meet our long term outcome.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Third grade reading achievement will increase 5% in FY20; moving from 73% to 78%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephanie Coletto (stephanie.coletto@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	* Our core instruction based on Florida Standards and the Test Item Specifications will be planned through backwards design in our PLC meetings. * We will use data to identify students performing below grade level. *Use a variety research-based interventions (LLI, Spire, Fundations, IReady toolkit, etc.) as determined by the decision tree to target areas of weakness. *Plan differentiated, small group instruction Using a double down approach in conjunction with support staff *Monitor progress regularly and revise instruction accordingly. *Students will be provided support through additional Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. *After school tutorial
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By executing the strategies named above, we will increase percentage of 3rd grade students reading on grade level as it aligns to the strategic plan. Students reading on grade level will increase from 73 to 78% on the FY20 FSA Assessment.

Action Step	
Description	1. PLC's a. Plan core instruction through backwards design using modules, test specs, standards and data b. Use only vetted resources to plan for effective and relevant instruction. c. Monitoring will occur through Administrations attendance of PLCs. Lesson plan review and student data analysis. Conduct PLC meetings with support staff to discuss strategies, interventions and resources. Conduct data chats with all teachers to monitor progress. Adjust interventions and instruction accordingly. 3. Plan targeted small group instruction based on student need as determined through assessment data. 4. Provide extra support through tier 2 and 3 interventions by qualified staff as determined by the decision tree. 5. Provide an after school tutorial program.
Person Responsible	Stephanie Coletto (stephanie.coletto@palmbeachschools.org)

#2	
Title	If we deliver personalized, standards-based Science instuction K-5, then we will increase Science proficiency by 7%; from 59% to 66%.
Rationale	Through data analysis, we determined that our 5th grade Science achievement has been stagnant. In FY 19, Science proficiency decreased by 7% as measured by the FCAT Science Assessment. The decline in Science stems from a systemic problem. Science has been on a steady decline in our school over the last 5 years as determined by the FCAT and diagnostic Science assessment data. Science achievement declined from 66% to 59% in FY19.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	5th grade science achievement will increase 7% in FY20; moving from 59 to 66%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephanie Coletto (stephanie.coletto@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	*A school-wide scope and sequence for Science will be developed to ensure that every grade level focuses on the content of their grade level Science standards. *A Computer based- Science program has been purchased to increase content knowledge and academic language. *Teach the Scientific methods through authentic science experiments designed to increase content understanding.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By using the strategies above we ill increase exposure to the Science content that students will need to be proficient by the time they get to 5th grade. If Science content is infused through the curriculum as well as through technology, it will ensure that grade level science standards are met in all grade k-5.
Action Step	
Description	1. Develop a school-wide scope and sequence through cross grade level collaboration. 2. Planning Science units using backwards design with the summative goal in mind. 3. Professional development in Science strategies, instruction and infusing Science content across the curriculum. 4. Purchase online supplemental Science standards-based resources like Mystery Science. 5. Ensure teachers develop a rotational schedule within their Science block for the Mystery Science program. 6. Increase use and understanding of the scientific method through experiments and academic language. 7. All the action steps above will be monitored through, administration attendance of PLC's, lesson plan reviews, classroom fidelity walks, and student data analysis.
Person Responsible	Stephanie Coletto (stephanie.coletto@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. Our students participate in activities and studies about:
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.

Sandpiper Shores Elementary 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 statue 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts.
We will promote a positive and supportive school climate that promotes the social emotional and academic development of all students. We will develop Social Emotional learning and infuse kindness and tolerance in our curriculum by adopting the Kindness Matters 365 curriculum which educates children on being kind to themselves and others and contributing to society so they can make a positive impact in their community and world. We will promote a single school culture in which all staff and students are kind and tolerant of each other.

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.

Our school communicates our vision and mission statements through SAC and our website
* Open House, Curriculum nights, PTA General Meetings combined with awards ceremonies to increase parent involvement and numerous monthly activities (day and evening), SAC, Parent Educational Training Opportunities, ESOL parent leadership nights, etc.
• Communicate classroom and school news to parents on a regular basis through memos, flyers, call outs,
Edline, Dojo and PTA newsletter
• Positive notes, letters, phone calls home
• Curriculum -based family nights (Math, Science, Reading, etc.)

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.

We will promote a positive and supportive school climate that promotes the social emotional and academic development of all students. We will develop Social Emotional learning and infuse kindness and tolerance in our curriculum by adopting the Kindness Matters 365 curriculum which educates children on being kind to themselves and others and contributing to society so they can make a positive

impact in their community and world. We will promote a single school culture in which all staff and students are kind and tolerant of each other.

Strategies used to assist students in transitioning through grade levels:
All members of the school staff participate in collaborative professional learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule. Collaboration occurs across grade levels and content areas. Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning. School personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.

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

The school-based MTSS Leadership Team meets weekly to review data. The team will identify the professional development activities needed, determine if changes need to be made, and determine if student needs are being met. The team will identify students who are not meeting identified academic targets and refer the to the school-based RtI Leadership Team.
Based on data and discussion the MTSS/RTI team will use the Problem Solving Model* to identify students who are in need of additional academic and/or behavioral support (supplemental or intensive). An intervention plan will be developed to target a student's specific areas of need and appropriate research-based interventions will be planned. The team will ensure the intervention is implemented with fidelity. The team will support the interventionist and report back on all data collected for further discussion at future meetings.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for success, following our Behavioral Matrix and teaching expected behaviors, communicating with parents and monitoring SwPBS.
We instill an appreciation for multicultural diversity through our anti bullying campaign, and implementation of SwPBS programs. Our school Counselors do character classroom lessons with our students as well as social skills groups.

Muticultural diversity is infused throughout the curriculum. Our students participate in art activities that highlight art from different cultures and in music our students study music of different eras and countries. Our media center is filled with books related to the variety of cultures and contributions of black and African Americans, Latino and Hispanics and women within US History. Our classroom teachers infuse these cultures and nationalities into the curriculum through literature, Social Studies and Science .Our fifth grade focuses on the Holocaust studies and culminates with a visit to the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington DC by our safety patrols.

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.

NA

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: If we deliver differentiated, rigorous standards-based instruction in 3rd grade, then we will increase reading proficiency by 5%. From 73% to 78%.**				$2,304.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1320	100-Salaries	1961 - Sandpiper Shores Elem. School	School Improvement Funds	885.87	$2,304.00
			Notes: For Reading tutorial program			
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: If we deliver personalized, standards-based Science instuction K-5, then we will increase Science proficiency by 7%; from 59% to 66%.**				$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1320	399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	1961 - Sandpiper Shores Elem. School	School Improvement Funds	885.87	$1,000.00
			Notes: Technology purchase			
					Total:	$3,304.00