College Park Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

College Park Elementary School

1330 SW 33RD AVE, Ocala, FL 34474

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Teresa Forsyth

Start Date for this Principal: 2/6/2018

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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (43%) 2014-15: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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 Marion 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

College Park Elementary School

1330 SW 33RD AVE, Ocala, FL 34474

[no web address on file]

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	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

Our mission at College Park Elementary School is to provide all students with the educational opportunities needed to develop academic skills and character traits necessary for a diverse and global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at College Park Elementary is to provide a quality education in a safe and nurturing environment.

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
Forsyth, Teresa	Principal	Principal: Oversees all school operations and establishes the collaborative culture of the school and its leadership team. Brings together district, school, and community stakeholders in planning, and implementing the SIP. Evaluates effective instructional practices in the classrooms and creates professional development specific to our school needs.
Robles, Noelle	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals: Support instructional vision of the principal, oversee teacher collaborative planning, coordinate scheduling, supervise paraprofessionals, assist guidance department, collect data, monitor MTSS implementation, plan professional development and establish best practices for student growth.
Black, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals: Support instructional vision of the principal, oversee teacher collaborative planning, coordinate scheduling, supervise paraprofessionals, assist guidance department, collect data, monitor MTSS implementation, plan professional development and establish best practices for student growth.
Barton, Rebecca	Dean	Dean: Supports the instructional vision of the principal, assists teachers to establish consistent classroom procedures, maintains behavior data, and supports student academic and social/emotional growth.
Duncan, Lindsay	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coaches: Provide professional development and content support, mentor new and developing teachers, model best practices and facilitate learning walks, communicate instructional goals and outcomes with parents and teachers, work with student intervention groups, and support the instructional vision of the principal.
Sadler, Camilla	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coaches: Provide professional development and content support, mentor new and developing teachers, model best practices and facilitate learning walks, communicate instructional goals and outcomes with parents and teachers, work with student intervention groups, and support the instructional vision of the principal.
Orange , Lorrie	Other	Intervention Teacher: Working with 3rd grade retainees and bottom quartile students.
Laiz, Noemi	School Counselor	Guidance Counselors: Facilitate MTSS process, support teachers in meeting social/emotional needs of students, monitor student attendance, communicate with parents and students, assist teachers with academic/behavior referral packets, and support the instructional vision of the principal.

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	120	127	103	140	125	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	760
Attendance below 90 percent	32	23	11	22	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	1	7	3	16	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	23	9	25	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	114	78	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	329
	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	22	35	28	53	35	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	252

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	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
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)

52

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/25/2019

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	33	24	21	21	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	10	9	17	22	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	15	37	17	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	63	60	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196

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	20	19	46	40	37	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222

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	33	24	21	21	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	10	9	17	22	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	15	37	17	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	63	60	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196

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	20	19	46	40	37	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222

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	36%	47%	57%	38%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	56%	58%	51%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	52%	53%	54%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	43%	51%	63%	49%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	48%	58%	62%	53%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	49%	51%	49%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	28%	47%	53%	35%	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	120 (0)	127 (0)	103 (0)	140 (0)	125 (0)	145 (0)	760 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	32 (33)	23 (24)	11 (21)	22 (21)	23 (10)	28 (22)	139 (131)
One or more suspensions	1 (10)	7 (9)	3 (17)	16 (22)	12 (13)	18 (24)	57 (95)
Course failure in ELA or Math	12 (9)	23 (15)	9 (37)	25 (17)	14 (10)	9 (6)	92 (94)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	114 (63)	78 (60)	137 (73)	329 (196)
	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	28%	44%	-16%	58%	-30%
	2018	39%	46%	-7%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison	-11%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	49%	-6%	58%	-15%
	2018	33%	43%	-10%	56%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison	10%					
Cohort Comparison	4%					
05	2019	24%	45%	-21%	56%	-32%
	2018	29%	46%	-17%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
Cohort Comparison	-9%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	38%	49%	-11%	62%	-24%
	2018	42%	48%	-6%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	54%	-2%	64%	-12%
	2018	44%	47%	-3%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison	8%					
Cohort Comparison	10%					
05	2019	29%	45%	-16%	60%	-31%
	2018	25%	50%	-25%	61%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison	4%					
Cohort Comparison	-15%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	23%	44%	-21%	53%	-30%
	2018	28%	49%	-21%	55%	-27%
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	16	34	45	23	34	29	4				
ELL	31	52	50	44	56	42	18				
BLK	23	41	72	30	41	44	21				
HSP	40	51	48	47	49	31	29				
MUL	45			18							
WHT	38	55		51	57		37				
FRL	32	48	59	39	49	35	22				

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	17	33	33	27	29	18	20				
ELL	24	41	45	37	27	20	10				
BLK	27	47	31	29	26	28	26				
HSP	36	40	35	40	34	22	31				
MUL	10			30							
WHT	46	54	70	53	35		43				
FRL	32	43	41	38	31	23	28				

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	7	40	46	22	38	43	24				
ELL	24	38	52	45	47	55	13				
BLK	31	59	57	43	48	53	11				
HSP	39	48	54	53	55	54	42				
MUL	45	65		36	47						
WHT	40	48		55	55	30	53				
FRL	33	46	53	46	49	47	31				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	349

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	43
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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	32
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	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	41
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 as measured by the NGSSS Statewide Science Assessment performed the lowest with only 28% of 5th grade students demonstrating proficiency by scoring a 3 or better in the 2018-2019 school year. This continues a downward trend over the last 2 school years representing a drop of 4% from Spring 2018. Contributing factors to this decline were the two continuous subs that we had in fifth grade.

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

Science proficiency as measured by the NGSSS Statewide Science Assessment performed the lowest with only 28% of 5th grade students demonstrating proficiency by scoring a 3 or better in the 2018-2019 school year. Contributing factors to this decline were the two continuous subs that we had in fifth grade.

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.

Fifth grade students performed 36 percent below the state in math proficiency as measure by the Spring FSA Mathematics assessment. Contributing factors to this decline were the two continuous subs that we had in fifth grade.

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

Fourth grade showed a 10 percent increase in ELA achievement from Spring 2018. During the double MTSS blocks, students transitioned to different teachers to receive small group interventions based on performance data. During collaborative planning, the teachers worked together to develop standards based instruction to support the needs of all students.

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

The number of referrals increased from 595 to 802, raising concern in the area of student discipline resulting from lack of social emotional skills.

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

1. Standards-based Instruction
2. Small group instruction
3. Social, Emotional Supports

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Standards-based Instruction
Rationale	A downward trend in student achievement in ELA, math, and science, as well as a significant drop in learning gains in 5th grade for both ELA and math as measured by FSA data, demonstrates a weakness in standards-based instructional practice.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If teachers implement effective standards-based instruction in ELA, math, and science, then student learning gains and proficiency in 3rd grade will increase by at least 5% in each area. Learning gains will increase using the following target indicators: Grade 3 Baseline ELA 28% Target 33%, Grade 3 Baseline Math 38% Target 43%, Grade 4 Baseline ELA 43% Target 48%, Grade 4 Baseline Math 52%, Target 57%, Grade 5 Baseline ELA 24% Target 29%, Grade 5 Baseline Math 29%, Target 34%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Collaborative Planning using Florida Standards to support standards-based instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This strategy was implemented last year and produced adequate learning gains in ELA and Math. Teachers will continue to receive support from Instructional Coaches and Assistant Principals in developing standards-based instruction through the use of academic resources.

Action Step	
Description	1. Schedule common collaborative planning twice a week to develop standards-based lessons, standards-based learning activities, and standards focus boards in ELA, math, and science. 2. Assistant Principals and Instructional coaches will support teachers in planning and instruction. 3. Develop a space for teachers to access plans, additional resources, and strategies discussed during collaborative planning.
Person Responsible	Rebecca Black (rebecca.black@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Targeted Small Group Instruction and Intervention
Rationale	A downward trend in student achievement in ELA, math, and science, as well as a significant drop in learning gains in 5th grade for both ELA and math as measured by FSA data, demonstrates a weakness in standards-based instructional practice.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If teachers utilize targeted small-group instruction in ELA, math, and science, then subgroups identified by the Federal Index below 41% will have learning gains increased by at least 5% in each area using the following target indicators; Black/African American Students in ELA 23% to 28%, Math 30% to 35%, Science 21% to 26%; Multi-Racial Students in ELA 25% to 30%, Math 18% to 23% and Students with Disabilities in ELA 16% to 21%, Math 23% to 28% and Science 4% to 9%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on administrator walkthroughs last year, teachers were implementing small group instruction and interventions. While the learning gains increased, there is a need to increase the rigor of the activities.
Action Step	
Description	1. Continue to build on targeted small group instruction and interventions with regular progress monitoring to meet specific learning needs of student subgroups, especially for our Multi-Racial, African-American and ESE student subgroups.
Person Responsible	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Social, Emotional Supports
Rationale	Discipline referrals increased significantly from the previous year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we implement a school-wide SEL curriculum, then students will develop social, emotional skills to help them self-regulate their behavior decreasing the number of Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3 referrals by 20%. Level 1 referrals will decrease from 336 to 269, Level 2 474 to 379 and Level 3 15 to 12.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Sanford Harmony is a research-based curriculum for SEL.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Discipline data indicated a need for a social, emotional learning curriculum. This program to be evidence based, and successful in other schools.

Action Step	
Description	1. Implement Sanford Harmony program. 2. The Guidance Counselor and Sanford Harmony Champion will receive further training on the program. 3. The Guidance Counselor and Sanford Harmony Champion will provide training to the teachers on how to implement the program in their classroom. 4. Support the teachers throughout the year.
Person Responsible	Rebecca Black (rebecca.black@marion.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).

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.

If we provide capacity building strategies to parents and families that address and promote family engagement in ELA, Math, and Science, then we will see increased learning gains for intermediate students and increased foundational skills in the primary grades as measured by local assessment and data.

Our site-based PFEP will describe our commitment to engage parents and families in the education of their children and to build the capacity to implement family engagement strategies and activities designed to achieve the school and student academic achievement goals. Through the following capacity building events; we will build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Title I Annual Meeting
To provide an explanation of Title I and begin the ongoing discussion of our school-wide participation and of its link to student achievement.
August 2019
Strong Fathers Reading
Parents, particularly fathers, will discover fun ways to help their students with reading at home.
TBD-Q1
Strong Fathers Math
Parents, particularly fathers, will discover fun ways to help their students with math at home. T
BD-Q2
Hispanic Heritage Celebration and Literacy Night
All families will celebrate diversity and we will model literature activities that help them to see how we are unique and yet the same.
September 2019
Science Night
Families will learn how they can engage their children in learning about science at home.
TBD-Q3

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.

STAGGER START is a district wide program designed to assist students in transitioning into local elementary schools. Eight to ten students per day attend school during the first two days giving staff the opportunity to administer assessments to develop one-on-one relationships with students, and to reduce the anxiety associated wit starting school. The state's STAR Early Literacy Assessment is one tool used to determine the readiness needs of these kindergarten students. Students who need intensive interventions will receive additional assistance from trained teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing a variety of interventions according to their unique learning needs. During the spring and summer kindergarten enrollment periods, information is shared with parents regarding the state funded voluntary Pre-K opportunities and the Home Instruction of Parents of Pre-School Youngsters (HIPPY). College Park offers two Title I VPK School Year programs to ensure students have a successful transition to kindergarten.

MCPS Psychological Services supports the united efforts of parents, educators, and the community to raise student performance. Psychological Services provides assessment, consultation, progress monitoring, and mental health services to improve the academic and emotional well-being of all students.
Crisis Response Resources
Information and resources to assist parents and educators help students through a time of crisis:
Talking to Children About Violence: Tips for Parents and Teachers
Bullies and Victims: A Primer for Parents
When Grief/Loss Hits Close to Home: Tips for Caregivers
Care for the Caregiver: Tips for Families and Educators
What You CAN Do - Meaningful Action Matters in the Face of Violence

Helping Children Cope With Traumatic Events
Trauma Informed Care Resources
Suicide Prevention - 13 Reasons Why: Information Sheet and Resource Guide
Prevensión del Suicidio Juvenil: Consejos para Padres y Educadores?

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

Before the beginning of the school year, the principal and leadership team evaluated the academic needs of the students by analyzing the data provided to us through local and state assessments. Other areas of need were also analyzed specific to our demographic, such as the need for more ELL small group reading materials due to our high population of students whose first language is not English. Orders for materials were coordinated through a series of planning meetings, and when they arrive are cataloged (scanned into local inventory system) and distributed to teachers and staff that are using the materials in instruction or support in ELA, Math, and Science. Weekly leadership meetings, and bi-monthly synergy meetings analyze the effectiveness of the utilization of the resources (personnel, curricular, and instructional) and adjustments are made based on the findings of their effectiveness. Additional professional development or other training may be required to increase the strategic use of those resources.

Early learning, elementary, middle and high school curriculum maps are shared and utilized throughout all levels of education to ensure an alignment of standards and expectations to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of student in transition from one school level to another.

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.

Marion County Public Schools implements standards provided by the state that are set to prepare students for success and make them competitive in the global workplace. Each Florida Standard provides clear expectations for the knowledge and skills students need to master in each grade (K-12) and subject so they will be prepared to succeed in college, careers and life.

MCPS School Progression Plan
Elementary School Instruction
Providing differentiated instruction for students at all levels is a best practice to meet students' needs in mastering the Florida Standards /Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. Instructionally sound strategies for grouping students will be used to enhance the academic achievement of all students. Any grouping of students shall provide opportunities for the regrouping of students during a portion of the school day.
Ability groups are organized according to accelerated needs such as higher-level coursework or remedial needs of individual students. Ability group configurations are flexible and continually monitored for student progress and movement. Grouping (whole class, within the grade level, and/or across grade levels) arrangements may include, but are not limited to:
(1) Flexible grouping strategies to meet needs of individual students
(2) Intervention-based grouping determined by screening, diagnostic, progress monitoring, or other assessments
(3) Cooperative grouping
(4) Small groups of mixed ability, and like ability
(5) Ability grouping for portions of school day
(6) Multi-age classes

(7) Departmentalization
(8) Team teaching within or across grade levels or looping (teacher instructing class for multiple years)
(9) Other accelerated options as described in § 1002.3105, Fla. Stat. (2018)
(10) Other grouping based on qualification for Exceptional Student Education (ESE) or English Language Learners (ELL) (e.g. inclusion model/support facilitation)

Each site Principal is responsible for site-based inventory of resources/services as well as necessary problem solving and application.

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

The district of Marion County Public Schools implements standards, provided by the state, that are set to prepare students for success and make them competitive in the global workplace. Each Florida Standard provides clear expectations for the knowledge and skills students need to master in each grade level (K-12) and subject area, so they will be prepared to succeed in college, a career and be functional in society on a daily basis. At the elementary level, this is established through STEM and STEAM curriculum, off and on campus field trips, and business and community volunteers.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Standards-based Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Targeted Small Group Instruction and Intervention	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Social, Emotional Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00