

Escambia County School District

Ensley Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Ensley Elementary School

501 E JOHNSON AVE, Pensacola, FL 32514

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Rhonda Sh UF Ord O

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2019

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	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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (36%) 2014-15: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Ensley Elementary School

501 E JOHNSON AVE, Pensacola, FL 32514

www.escambiaschools.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	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	84%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

All children at Ensley Elementary can and must learn.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through united partnerships with every child, family and teacher; we can grow together to build student 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
Shuford, Rhonda	Principal	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Jones, Julie	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Palmer, Myra	Instructional Media	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Jones, Iris	School Counselor	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Ramirez, Roel	Other	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Schoonover, Anne Marie	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Rockwell, Patricia	Teacher, ESE	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Thomas, Dr. Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Grepke, Tracy	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Livingston, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Delgado, Andria	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Guice, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Smolensky, Regina	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	21	23	15	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	6	9	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	4	2	9	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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)**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 8/13/2019

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	6	0	6	5	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	2	13	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	1	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	6	0	6	5	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	2	13	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	1	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	41%	53%	57%	34%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	58%	38%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	53%	41%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	49%	57%	63%	40%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	60%	62%	45%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	51%	37%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	54%	53%	37%	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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	21 (6)	23 (0)	15 (6)	21 (5)	15 (6)	0 (3)	95 (26)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (2)	2 (0)	1 (0)	1 (5)	5 (8)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	4 (6)	6 (2)	9 (13)	3 (4)	3 (4)	25 (29)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (8)	19 (14)	19 (26)	48 (48)

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	31%	56%	-25%	58%	-27%
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	57%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	56%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	26%	51%	-25%	56%	-30%
	2018	26%	44%	-18%	55%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	38%	55%	-17%	62%	-24%
	2018	53%	54%	-1%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	58%	8%	64%	2%
	2018	48%	58%	-10%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	31%	55%	-24%	60%	-29%
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	30%	55%	-25%	53%	-23%
	2018	35%	55%	-20%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	13	33	40	16	47	55					

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	37	56	45	49	55		31				
BLK	35	57	50	41	54	46	22				
HSP	34	55	50	46	50		31				
MUL	81	69		69	77						
WHT	36	44		54	63						
FRL	40	56	57	46	59	52	34				
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	5	6	12	15	28	25	14				
ELL	33	40		60	57						
ASN	60			80							
BLK	24	25	23	37	43	37	21				
HSP	49	54		64	61		25				
MUL	55	70		67	80						
WHT	37	29		60	58		69				
FRL	34	33	32	50	52	36	38				
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	4	34	33	14	33	37					
ELL	33	47		47	63						
ASN	55			73							
BLK	27	28	33	32	36	33	24				
HSP	45	42		47	50		54				
MUL	42	31		47	64						
WHT	33	52		38	40		50				
FRL	34	41	44	41	47	38	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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	44
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	48
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	74
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	49
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	52
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.

Science proficiency showed the lowest performance going from 39% in 2018 to 38% in 2019. Factors contributing to last year's low performance included 2 out of 3 teachers were new to our 5th grade team and had never taught before.

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

Math proficiency showed the greatest decline going from 52% in 2018 to 49% in 2019. Factors contributing to this decline included teachers who were new to teaching.

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.

Ensley's ELA data had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Factors contributing to this gap include low ELA proficiency scores across grade levels.

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

ELA lowest quartile learning gains showed the most improvement increasing from 27% in 2018 to 48% in 2019, which is an increase of 21 percentage points. Our Literacy Coach pulled the lowest quartile groups and worked with them 3 times a week and we also utilized i-Ready next steps for individual students.

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

In reflecting on the EWS data, one potential area of concern is the attendance below 90% last year (2018-19). The information was 21-K, 23 first, 15 second, 21 third, 15 fourth and 18 fifth for a total of 113.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Math proficiency
3. Science proficiency
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title •Students With Disabilities

Rationale •Based on 2019 FSA data, the Federal Index for our Students With Disabilities was 34%, which fell below the 41% state target.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

•Ensley will increase the Federal Index for our Students With Disabilities working towards reaching the state target.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Rhonda Shuford (rshuford@escambia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

•Provide professional development on accommodations for general education and special education teachers.
•Strengthen Tier I instruction by providing professional development to the faculty on Universal Design for Learning and monitor implementation with classroom visits looking for multiple forms of content representation, multiple options of action and expression, and multiple means of engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

•Ensley Elementary has many teachers new to teaching. We want to provide professional development to enable teachers to maximize learning for Students With Disabilities in the classroom.

Action Step

Description

1. Seek ESE personnel to provide professional development to teachers
2. Establish dates for professional development
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Person Responsible

Rhonda Shuford (rshuford@escambia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	•Reading
Rationale	•Ensley is on the list of the lowest 300 schools in the state due to our ELA proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	•Ensley will improve our ELA proficiency on the 2020 FSA. Our proficiency was 41% in 2019.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberly Thomas (kthomas3@escambia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	•We will review assessment data (i.e. STAR 360, DRA, SRA in program assessments, Wonders Unit Assessments, Third Grade Portfolio, iReady, etc.) . every two weeks and hold data meetings to identify students in need of intervention, determine who will provide the intervention(s), and with the use of the District K-5 Intervention Decision tree, determine appropriate intervention and duration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	•By reviewing data, we will be able to determine next steps using best practices using the ECSD K-5 Intervention Decision tree.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish data meeting dates after assessments. 2. Meet with teachers. 3. Students will review data, set goals and conference with teachers on the data. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Thomas (kthomas3@escambia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	•Math
Rationale	•Ensley Elementary School's math proficiency dropped from 52% in 2018 to 49% in 2019.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	•Ensley will improve our math proficiency on the 2020 FSA. Our proficiency was 49% in 2019.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberly Thomas (kthomas3@escambia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Provide professional development through the mathematics department focused on standard based planning with the aspect of rigor linked. •Utilize K-12 Everglades resources for intervention and reteaching during small group instruction. Professional development provided by the math department to understand how to utilize resources and to set up a calendar of accountability utilizing the probes in schoolnet for assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	•Ensley Elementary has many teachers new to teaching. We want to provide professional development to enable teachers to maximize learning for all students in the classroom.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contact math department for TSA to deliver professional development. 2. Establish training date. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Rhonda Shuford (rshuford@escambia.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	•Science
Rationale	•Ensley Elementary School's science proficiency dropped from 39% in 2018 to 38% in 2019.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	•Ensley will improve our science proficiency on the 2020 FSA. Our proficiency was 38% in 2019.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberly Thomas (kthomas3@escambia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Purchase Study Island software for 5th grade to assist in small group remediation of standards. •Teachers will meet in PLC's to discuss progress monitoring and formative assessment data. •Professional development for science planning for grade levels with science specialist •Utilize Eureka books that were purchased by the district for the school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	•By reviewing data, we will be able to determine next steps using best practices.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Follow through on the purchase of Study Island. 2. Train teachers on using Study Island. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Myra Palmer (mpalmer@escambia.k12.fl.us)

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).

Ensley will use best practices in each Area of Focus and for Inclusive Education.

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.

Ensley Elementary has a written Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) in collaboration with parents, community stakeholders, and school personnel responsible for implementing the plan. The plan will outline

goals, strategies and activities to better communicate with families and will focus on building the capacity of parents to address the needs of all students, in particular those most at-risk of not meeting state academic standards. A Family-School Compact will also be developed jointly with parents and other stakeholders. The school's Title I budget will directly support the PFEP.

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.

Escambia County School District offers pre-k classes on 14 school campuses for students living in a Title I attendance zone. The pre-k program is a full day program established in collaboration with VPK and Head Start. Transition activities are provided to participating families to assist with school readiness for students who will attend kindergarten at our school.

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 A

Academic support is provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through purchasing a Literacy Coach to provide model lessons for teachers and professional development in ELA. In addition Kindergarten and first grade students will be utilizing SRA and second grade students will be utilizing Tyner for small group instruction.

Title I, Part C Migrant

All migrant students will be provided support services by the district Title I office. Our local student information system (FOCUS) is used to track student data and is used to indicate the specific Title I services each migrant student will be provided (attendance, guidance, psychology services, dental and health services, nutrition assistance, outreach, advocacy, social services, transportation, and/or needs assessment services). The district Migrant Coordinator will monitor services and student needs.

Title I, Part D

Services to neglected and delinquent students are provided by various district-operated programs as needed. These services are overseen by the Alternative Education Department and focus on offering programs to students who are most at-risk of leaving school prior to graduation.

Title II

Professional learning opportunities are offered both at the school level and the district level. Please see each individual goal area for specific professional learning opportunities (in-service education).

Title III-ELL

Services for English Language Learners (ELL) are provided as required by law. Several ESOL centers are provided at various key locations in the district. Students who do not attend centrally located school-based sites attend their zoned school where ESOL endorsed teachers provide services.

Title IX- Homeless

The school works with the district's Homeless Coordinator to provide transportation and resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as Homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. This program is overseen by the Title I office.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: •Students With Disabilities				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0271 - Ensley Elementary School	General Fund	1.0	\$0.00
<i>Notes: Professional Development</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: •Reading				\$54,508.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$31,701.00
<i>Notes: Literacy Coach</i>						
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$2,172.00
<i>Notes: Accelerated Reader Subscription Renewal</i>						
	5100	510-Supplies	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$12,555.00
<i>Notes: Supplemental materials to support ELA in classrooms</i>						
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$2,700.00
<i>Notes: PD with Literacy Coach</i>						
	6400	510-Supplies	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$1,380.00
<i>Notes: Books for book study</i>						
	6200	612-Library Books for Existing Libraries	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$4,000.00
<i>Notes: Build supplemental library collections for students</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: •Math				\$18,055.00

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Other	1.0	\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Substitutes for professional development</i>			
	5100	520-Textbooks	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: Everglades K-12 workbooks for 3rd-5th grade students</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$12,555.00
			<i>Notes: Supplemental materials to support Math</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: •Science				\$14,555.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6200	319-Technology-Related Professional and Technical Services	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Study Island</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$12,555.00
			<i>Notes: Supplementary materials to support Science</i>			
					Total:	\$87,118.00