Melaleuca Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Melaleuca Elementary School

5759 GUN CLUB RD, West Palm Beach, FL 33415

https://mele.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Deborah Maupin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: C (44%)
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

Melaleuca Elementary School

5759 GUN CLUB RD, West Palm Beach, FL 33415

https://mele.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 KG-5	Yes	94%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

School Grades History

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

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.

Melaleuca 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.

Melaleuca Elementary will instill in our school community the requisite social, academic, technological, and critical thinking skills for promoting success in an ever changing global society.

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
Maupin, Deborah	Principal	Provide instructional leadership and ensure a safe orderly environment for all.
Morales, Irene	Instructional Coach	Facilitates professional learning communities and overseas the MTSS process to ensure that all students are meeting the academic expectations.
Atwell, Amy	Teacher, ESE	Responsible for the scheduling of and supporting students' Individual Education Plans. Is the contact in charge of providing direct support to parents in the development and implementation of IEPs.
Gonzalez, Monica	Instructional Coach	Provides modeling and coaching support to teachers in our DL program. In addition, provides direct intervention support to students in the DL program.
Moreno, Rachel	Other	The ESOL coordinator manages, maintains, updates the ELL plans of ELs. Coordinates and administers initial placement assessment; monitors instruction and provides modeling support and coaching to teachers of ELs.
Swiatlowski, Crystal	Assistant Principal	Provide instructional leadership and ensure a safe orderly environment for all.

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	94	82	113	123	116	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	660
Attendance below 90 percent	26	19	18	19	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	1	4	1	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	24	26	30	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	37	37	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	10	4	23	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	3	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
45

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 9/5/2019

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	12	29	20	39	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	2	1	6	4	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	31	33	54	43	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	64	54	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159

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	2	13	14	46	39	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135

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	12	29	20	39	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	2	1	6	4	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	31	33	54	43	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	64	54	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159

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	2	13	14	46	39	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135

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	49%	58%	57%	40%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	63%	58%	48%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	56%	53%	44%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	60%	68%	63%	50%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	68%	62%	55%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	59%	51%	48%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	51%	53%	34%	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	94 (0)	82 (0)	113 (0)	123 (0)	116 (0)	132 (0)	660 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	26 (12)	19 (29)	18 (20)	19 (39)	20 (22)	23 (15)	125 (137)
One or more suspensions	1 (2)	4 (1)	1 (6)	3 (4)	2 (9)	6 (4)	17 (26)
Course failure in ELA or Math	4 (3)	24 (31)	26 (33)	30 (54)	21 (43)	15 (19)	120 (183)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	37 (64)	37 (54)	72 (41)	146 (159)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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	46%	54%	-8%	58%	-12%
	2018	41%	56%	-15%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	62%	-12%	58%	-8%
	2018	41%	58%	-17%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	42%	59%	-17%	56%	-14%
	2018	42%	59%	-17%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	65%	-1%	62%	2%
	2018	52%	63%	-11%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	67%	-22%	64%	-19%
	2018	36%	63%	-27%	62%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	55%	65%	-10%	60%	-5%
	2018	61%	66%	-5%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	29%	51%	-22%	53%	-24%
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
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	20	46	52	36	54	52	27				

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	43	55	50	56	56	46	25				
BLK	35	59	58	50	55	50	3				
HSP	52	62	63	61	58	47	39				
WHT	57	61		80	79		50				
FRL	48	61	63	59	58	48	28				

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	19	48	54	35	64	58	14				
ELL	37	53	53	47	53	72	27				
BLK	35	44	41	54	70	60	61				
HSP	46	55	52	57	63	70	47				
WHT	48	63		61	71						
FRL	43	51	50	56	64	66	49				

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	17	50	41	27	48	58	33				
ELL	26	42	49	40	51	38	12				
BLK	28	49	47	31	49	58	27				
HSP	40	46	46	52	56	43	32				
WHT	54	50		75	69		70				
FRL	38	47	45	49	54	48	32				

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	54
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	428
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	49
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	
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	46
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	55
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	65
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	53
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.

A review of the subgroup data for each component shows that Students with Disabilities has the lowest achievement (20% proficient) and learning gains (46% learning gains) of any subgroup. Compared to white students who were 57% proficient with 61% learning gains and Hispanic students who were 52% proficient with 62% learning gains. The trend shows inconsistent performance for students in this subgroup. A contributing factor to the low performance of students is the lack of resources to target the specific needs of our students with disabilities. While the number of students in this group varies each year, they represent a wide range of disabilities. Historically, it has been difficult to help this group make consistent learning gains.

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

While science showed the greatest decline from the prior year (from 45% to 29% proficient), it is also important to note that math learning gains scores from 2019 declined significantly as well. The math learning gains scores decreased from 64%(2018) to 58%(2019) learning gains. The math learning gains of the students in the L25 decreased from 66% (2018) to 48% (2019).The multiple vacancies and the number of new math teachers definitely contributed to the decline. In addition, the lack of fidelity of implementation and rigor in the math classrooms was also an issue.

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.

When looking at science data, our school had a 16% decline from 2018. We moved from 45% to 29% proficient. Additionally, there was a 22% gap in comparison to the school and district/state performance. The decline is most likely due to the lack of rigor in the science classrooms along with the lack of fidelity of implementation of the new science series.

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

Overall, the greatest improvements and gains were seen in ELA across all grade levels. Overall ELA proficiency went from 44% in 2018 to 49% in 2019. In addition, learning gains improved from 52% (2018) to 61%(2019). While the learning gains of students in the L25 also improved from 51% (2018) to 61%(2019). The improvements were largely due to a focus on standards and rigor in the ELA block. In addition, the implementation of a cohesive writing curriculum provided a framework for teaching writing.

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

Reflection on the EWS data from Part I, the potential areas of concern are the numbers of students performing at level 1 on state assessments in both ELA and math. While we did improve from 183 students to 120 student earning a level 1 in either ELA and math, we continue to see this area as a cause for concern. In addition, attendance below 90% is another cause from concern. We saw some improvement with a decrease in this category from 137 to 125. But, we continue to consider this area as a cause for concern as well.

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

1. Improve science instruction and achievement
2. Continue the implementation of standards based ELA instruction
3. Increase rigor in math classrooms

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	To ensure progress towards student achievement in ELA and math to align with district strategic plan including a focus on LTO #1: Ensuring 3rd grade reading proficiency.
Rationale	Historically, our ELA proficiency falls into the higher gains, but lower achievement category. Our ELL and Black students have had the lowest achievement over the past three years. Our overall ELA proficiency had the greatest gap. In order to meet our target for the strategic plan, we need to increase overall ELA proficiency by more than 13 points. When looking at our overall data for math, we dropped significantly in learning gains for students in the L25.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of SY20 school year, we will increase ELA proficiency and math learning gains by 15%. We will increase ELA proficiency from 49% to 58% and increase the math learning gains from 58% to 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Irene Morales (irene.morales@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Reading teachers will implement a coherent curriculum that focuses on academic standards. 2. ELA and math teachers will engaged in focused, standards based instruction cycle through Professional Learning Communities. The goal will be to focus on the "how" of instruction and what we do when when students are not learning or meeting mastery. 3. Differentiated small group instruction will be utilized in all ELA and math classrooms. 4. Students will engage in personalized learning solutions that provide support/reteaching at their level (iready and Successmaker).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	1. In k-3, teachers will implement the Benchmark curriculum. The materials and resources are designed to provide a coherent sequence of instruction for general and dual language classrooms. 2. Engaging in a standards based teaching/learning professional learning cycle provides a high degree of accountability. It provides teachers and teams with the opportunity to progress monitor the achievement of all students. 3. Small group instruction provides an opportunity for teachers to personalize the learning and provide direct instruction to students at varying levels. 4. Iready and Successmaker will offer an opportunity for students to receive reteaching and remediation on a variety of skills. The ability to personalize instruction to meet individual needs will result in increased scores.

Action Step	
Description	1. Develop a master schedule which ensures that students will receive additional support (ELL/ESE) in a push in environment. 2. Identify students who are in the L25 in both reading and math. Provide opportunities for additional support for those students, including wrap around services (SEL support) and in and out of school tutorial. 3. School leadership and SSCC will support and monitor the PLC learning cycle, ensure data analysis and conduct frequent walkthroughs. 4. Ensure that students are engaged in rigorous, standards based instruction throughout the school day.

Person Responsible Deborah Maupin (deborah.maupin@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).

Our school has a Single School Culture for behavior and academics. Our Universal Guidelines and Eagle Expectations are taught to students, communicated to parents, and monitored through our School Wide PBS committee. In addition, our school ensures that in accordance with school board 2.09 and Florida State Statute 1003.42 that we infuse multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. Our students engage in a variety of activities that immerse them in rigorous tasks to meet the expectations of the Florida Standards. In addition, content required by State statute 1003.42 is infused across the curriculum in a variety of ways. Instruction focuses on content related to: The history of the Holocaust, the history of Black and African Americans, the contributions of Latinos and Hispanics, the contributions of women and the sacrifices of veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History.

Additional content required for instruction by Florida Statute 1003.42(2) as applicable to appropriate grade levels, include:
• Declaration of Independence
• Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights
• Federalist papers: Republican form of government
• Flag education
• Civil government: functions and interrelationships
• History of the United States
• Principles of Agriculture
• Effects of alcohol and narcotics
• Kindness to animals
• Florida history
• Conservation of natural resources
• Health education
• Free enterprise
• Character-development program (required K-12) with curriculum to address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance;and cooperation.

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.

See attached Family Involvement plan summary.

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.

Melaleuca Elementary has various programs and strategies in place to help children transition from early childhood to elementary school. Melaleuca provides a Kindergarten Orientation (Round Up) in the Spring as well as a Meet your Teacher Day. The members of our staff participate in professional learning communities that meet both formally and informally on a regular schedule within and across grade levels, content areas and feeder schools. The goal is to formally discuss student learning and clearly link collaboration to improvement results instructional practice and student performance.

Guided tours are made available to parents and families in surrounding preschools. In addition, a staggered start schedule during the first week of school is offered.

Flyers and the school website are publicized and shared with local preschools to help the students begin to connect with the local elementary school.

Allow classroom visitations for transitioning students and their parents.

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

Title I, Part C- Migrant and support services are provided by district support personnel in coordination with school based facilitators. Celia Elrod-district contact person. Title II funds programs and Professional Development provided by Safe Schools – Single School Culture; Academic, Behavior and Climate, Programs, Bullying Prevention, Character Education, and School Wide Positive Behavior Support are integrated into the school's curriculum. Nutrition programs (100% Accessible Breakfast Program, Free and Reduced Lunch,Free Dinner, Fresh Fruits and Vegetables) for qualifying students are supported.The school provides "Commit to Be Fit" agendas for all students. Title X provides support to students and families identified as homeless as needed.

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 MTSS/RTI Leadership Team will meet regularly to review universal screening data, diagnostic, and progress monitoring data. This information will help the team identify activities needed to create effective learning environments. Once Tier 1/Core instruction is in place, the team will identify students who are not meeting identified academic targets. Identified students will be referred to the MTSS/RTI team. Once students are identified, the MTSS/RtI leadership team will work through the problem solving process to determine small group interventions, teacher supports, or additional resources that are needed to meet the needs of individual students. Title I funding is used at the school to purchase a single school culture coordinator, a reading intervention teacher and a part time science/math teacher. The SSC leads our PLC meetings to ensure that best practices/standards are being utilized when planning. She also leads the MTSS team to ensure teachers and team members understand the process, interventions and how to best monitor fidelity of the interventions. The Science teacher teachers students in grade K-5 in the science lab for hands on experiments and practice with the scientific model.Title I funding also provides professional development, tutorials and additional funding for family involvement resources.

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

Our school has a partnership with TeamWork, USA to provide scholarships and funding for a leadership club. The club and focus on leadership helps to provide college and career awareness. In addition, our

school implements AVID strategies and a philosophy that promotes the development of skills necessary for college and post high school careers. Finally, we work closely with colleges like University of Central Florida to provide information about college and college visits each year. TeamWork, USA also funds the Leadership grant which gives us the opportunity to provide $1000 college scholarships to select five students selected from 3, 4 and 5th grade students. They also supports us in our 3rd year of implementation of AVID in grades 2-5 to help students prepare for life after High School and be college/career ready.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: To ensure progress towards student achievement in ELA and math to align with district strategic plan including a focus on LTO #1: Ensuring 3rd grade reading proficiency.**				**$2,500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1441 - Melaleuca Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$2,500.00
			Notes: Purchase resources and materials for after school tutorial. Will be determined upon SAC approval.			
					Total:	**$2,500.00**