

Duval County Public Schools

# Love Grove Elementary School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Love Grove Elementary School

2446 UNIVERSITY BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32216

<http://www.duvalschools.org/lovegrove>

## Demographics

**Principal: Kendall Parris**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: D (38%) 2014-15: C (52%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

## Love Grove Elementary School

2446 UNIVERSITY BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32216

<http://www.duvalschools.org/lovegrove>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

Mission: To provide educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

This will be accomplished through our collective concentration on the four pillars of excellent instruction designed to foster student success in every classroom when students are:

Fully engaged in the work of the lessons

Working on appropriately rigorous content

Taking ownership of their learning

Demonstrating understanding of the content

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and life.

This will be accomplished through sustaining a culture of academic achievement, goal setting and college/career focus fostered by our STEAM theme. Concentration within the STEAM content areas (science, technology, engineering, arts and math) will inspire and prepare our students for success.

### 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
Emanuel-Wright, Tiffany	Principal	
Fuller, Nicole	Instructional Coach	Reading Interventionist
Duffy, Jill	Teacher, ESE	ESE Lead Teacher
Shaaber, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	Varying Exceptionalities Teacher
Booth, John	Assistant Principal	
Nessler, Anne	Instructional Coach	Math Interventionist
Bigelow, Cara	Teacher, ESE	VE Teacher
Summers, Janet	School Counselor	

### 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	71	76	65	63	58	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
Attendance below 90 percent	26	23	19	13	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	2	7	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	17	52	41	46	36	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	238

**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	11	41	32	31	26	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	178

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	12	22	93	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
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)**

379

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/1/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**
**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## 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	40%	50%	57%	45%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	58%	57%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	50%	53%	60%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	47%	62%	63%	49%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	63%	62%	64%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	52%	51%	65%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	48%	53%	41%	50%	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	71 (0)	76 (0)	65 (0)	63 (0)	58 (0)	60 (0)	393 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	26 ( )	23 ( )	19 ( )	13 ( )	17 ( )	14 ( )	112 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	2 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	7 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ( )	4 (0)	2 (0)	7 (0)	1 (0)	6 (0)	20 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	17 ( )	52 (0)	41 (0)	46 (0)	36 (0)	46 (0)	238 (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	24%	51%	-27%	58%	-34%
	2018	37%	50%	-13%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	52%	-10%	58%	-16%
	2018	30%	49%	-19%	56%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	25%	50%	-25%	56%	-31%
	2018	38%	51%	-13%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	61%	-9%	62%	-10%
	2018	49%	59%	-10%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	64%	-9%	64%	-9%
	2018	41%	60%	-19%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	25%	57%	-32%	60%	-35%
	2018	36%	61%	-25%	61%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	49%	-14%	53%	-18%
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

### Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	41	58	57	33	47	54	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	29	55	43	46	58	45	50				
ASN	50	67		57	50						
BLK	49	61		33	36		46				
HSP	31	50	46	50	58	36	44				
WHT	39	55	54	57	54		31				
FRL	37	52	50	50	54	50	42				
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	38	38	30	31	38		24				
ELL	38	59		54	45						
ASN	27			55							
BLK	53	35		38	27		43				
HSP	37	59		49	44		45				
WHT	42	52		53	55		47				
FRL	42	44	42	49	43	29	47				
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	14	45		26	59	70					
ELL	35	53		56	71						
BLK	42	63		45	58	46	38				
HSP	31	42		48	65						
WHT	56	62		52	72		47				
FRL	42	52	56	47	64	70	39				

### 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	50
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	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	56
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	45
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	47
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	48
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	49
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 proficiency was the lowest area of performance at 40%.  
Contributing factors included high ELL and ESE populations.

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

ELA proficiency was also the greatest decline from the previous year, going from 44% down to 40%.  
Contributing factors included high ELL and ESE populations.

**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 proficiency showed the greatest gap compared to the state average (40% school to 57% state).  
Contributing factors included high ELL and ESE populations.

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

Bottom quartile math showed the most improvement, from 29% to 46%.  
The school had/has a math interventionist and ESE VE teacher targeting the bottom quartile in math.

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

Reflecting on the EWS, the biggest area of concern is the amount of students whose attendance is under 90%.

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

1. Reading competency
2. Math competency

3. Science competency
4. Increasing attendance
5. Parent involvement

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1**

**Title** Reading Proficiency

**Rationale** The school's proficiency in Reading for the 2018-2019 school year was 40%. Learning Gains were 55% and BQ Learning Gains were 54%.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve**

Our goal for the 2019-2020 school year is to increase our proficiency to 47%. Learning Gains to 60% and BQ Learning Gains to 60%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Tiffany Emanuel-Wright (emanuelt@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy**

Our school will be utilizing Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading. These are research based strategies that should improve the overall word attack/decoding strategies of our students and increase reading comprehension. In addition, we will continue to utilize core LAFS and I-Ready and Achieve 3000 blended learning. Resources per Title I: Additional Paraprofessional support to guide small group instruction with Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading, Interactive Technology to enhance student engagement and monitor student progress, Instructional materials to provide tangible resources for the reading interventionist, paraprofessional and other assigned adult personnel.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

Reading Mastery Signature Edition and Corrective Reading are research-based programs that have been proven to increase proficiency and learning gains for students with reading deficits. Current district ISI Region data supports this finding.

**Action Step**

**Description**

1. Students in grades K-2 were given a placement test to determine levels of competency for RMSE.
2. Students in grades 3-5 were given a placement test to determine levels of competency for Corrective.
3. RMSE and Corrective students will be given intensive during the Reading Block based on their level.
4. Students in the falls far below category on Achieve will be in computer lab from 8-8:30
5. Students will utilize Achieve and I-Ready blended learning daily. Students below level will increase their minutes to 70 minutes per week.
6. Additional instructional push-in model support to align with the Reading Interventionist (Para).

**Person Responsible**

Tiffany Emanuel-Wright (emanuelt@duvalschools.org)

#2	
<b>Title</b>	Math Proficiency
<b>Rationale</b>	The school's proficiency in Math for the 2018-2019 school year was 47%. Learning Gains were 50% and BQ Learning Gains were 46%.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Our goal for the 2019-2020 school year is to increase our proficiency to 50%. Learning Gains to 58% and BQ Learning Gains to 55%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Tiffany Emanuel-Wright (emanuelt@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Our school will be utilizing Acaletics, a Math supplement. This research based program should improve the overall math knowledge and fluency strategies of our students and increase Math concept comprehension. We will continue to utilize core Eureka Math and I-Ready blended learning. Resources per Title I: Additional Paraprofessional support to guide small group instruction with Acaletics, Interactive Technology to enhance student engagement and monitor student progress, Instructional materials to provide tangible resources for the reading interventionist, paraprofessional and other assigned adult personnel.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Acaletics and Eureka Math are research-based programs that have been proven to increase proficiency and learning gains for students with reading deficits. Current district ISI Region data supports this finding.
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students in grades 2-5 were given a placement test to determine levels of competency for Acaletics.</li> <li>2. RMSE and Corrective students will be given intensive during the Reading Block based on their level.</li> <li>3. Students in the below category on I-Ready will be in computer lab from 8-8:30</li> <li>4. Students will utilize I-Ready blended learning daily. Students below level will increase their minutes to 70 minutes per week.</li> <li>5. Additional instructional push-in model support to align with the Math Interventionist (Para).</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Tiffany Emanuel-Wright (emanuelt@duvalschools.org)

#3	
<b>Title</b>	Student Engagement
<b>Rationale</b>	Based on John Hattie's research, student engagement through classroom discussion and feedback have a .82 and .70 effect size. Therefore, that means that these strategies have the potential to considerably accelerate student achievement.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The measurable outcome would be to increase student proficiency in Reading from 40% to 47% and proficiency in Math from 47% to 50%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Tiffany Emanuel-Wright (emanuelt@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Increase student engagement through additional small group instruction and more opportunities for one-to-one contact student discussion and immediate feedback couple with appropriately integrated technology promoting student interactive competencies. Resources per Title I: Additional Paraprofessional support to support student engagement through small group instruction, Interactive Technology to enhance student engagement and monitor student progress, Instructional materials to provide tangible resources for the reading interventionist, paraprofessional and other assigned adult personnel to engage with students.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Research and evidence based effect sizes discussed in John Hattie's Visible Learning as it relates to Student Engagement.
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase Small Group instruction (teacher-led, VE teacher-led, reading &amp; math interventionist-led, paraprofessional-led, administration led)</li> <li>2. Increase classroom discussion through small group interactions.</li> <li>3. Provide immediate feedback to students through increase adult one-to-one contact (teacher, VE teacher, interventionist, paraprofessional, administration)</li> <li>4. Implement tutoring groups to address the needs and engage students who are approaching proficiency.</li> <li>5. Utilize interactive and engaging technology to enhance student engagement and provide immediate feedback.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Tiffany Emanuel-Wright (emanuelt@duvalschools.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).**

N/A

## 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.**

Through multiple means of communication, the school will notify all parents of opportunities to participate in school activities in a timely manner. The school will provide Spanish translators and material in order to serve the large Hispanic population of parents and students. The school will also provide flexible meeting times to assist parents with their work schedules. The school will use social media websites to inform parents of events at school and keep them updated on the latest events. The school also uses parent link calls to keep in touch with parents.

**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 school has a full service schools counselor from Child Guidance that works with students who have extensive social-emotional needs. The school also has a school counselor to assist students with social emotional learning. Teachers also incorporate social emotional learning instruction within daily lessons utilizing Sanford Harmony and Second Step. In addition, both the general education and ESE departments have functional behavior assessments to assist students with meeting their social-emotional goals. The school also practices positive behavior intervention systems to promote intrinsic and restorative practices.

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

The school, along with the full service schools team, offers fifth grade students and parents the opportunity to participate in a Transitioning to Middle School workshop. It is a two hour group session designed to help prepare students for the social and emotional challenges that they may face in their first year of middle school. In general, students will learn social skills and mental wellness tips.

Incoming kindergarten cohorts have introductory packets for parents explaining various aspects of the school and how the school transportation system operates.

**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.**

Based on our current school data, our initial goal will focus on ensuring that through fidelity instruction and strategic data analysis and tracking that our bottom-quartile students are meeting targeted learning gains throughout the year. Administration and Interventionists will analyze individual student data on a weekly basis within common planning and with push-in support personnel. Administration will provide researched-based resources for teachers that can be differentiated to meet individual student learning

needs. All students will be supplied with individual student data tracking notebooks to self-monitor their academic progress throughout the year. School leadership, led by the principal, will work with faculty members through the utilization of weekly common planning to strategically monitor the effectiveness of prescribed resources through data tracking to ensure that students are demonstrating understanding of the standards and increasing their achievement percentages throughout the school year. Reading and math interventionists collaborate with the leadership team and general education teachers regarding literacy interventions, accommodations, and modifications for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students in reading. The interventionists assess student data and work with the classroom teacher to develop plans that supports the students' needs. Various interventions are used including Reading Mastery (standard edition and corrective), LAFS, Leveled Literacy Intervention, I-Ready Reading Tool Kit, Language for Learning, Eureka math and Acaletics math. Students are pulled for interventions that address learning priorities to help remediate academic deficiencies..

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

The school uses Achieve 3000 lexiles career toolbox to show students what reading levels they need to achieve for specific career fields. The guidance department also has a college week program to introduce students to degree programs and possible career choices.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading Proficiency	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00