

Escambia County School District

Brentwood 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Brentwood Elementary School

4820 N PALAFOX ST, Pensacola, FL 32505

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Sewell

Start Date for this Principal: 6/4/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (43%) 2014-15: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Brentwood Elementary School

4820 N PALAFOX ST, Pensacola, FL 32505

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 KG-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	68%

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 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.

The mission of Brentwood Elementary is to ensure that every student has the self-confidence, desire, knowledge, and skills needed to lead a responsible and satisfied life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In keeping with our district's vision to be a place where students want to learn, teachers want to teach, parents want to send their children, and employees want to work:

It is the desire of Brentwood Faculty and Staff that we capture the heart and mind of students, parents, and our community, by creating an excellent learning environment for all. We strive to promote love of learning through the use of: Cutting-edge teaching and learning tools, encouragement of good citizenship, and providing problem-solving opportunities so that students will flourish in tomorrow's technology infused world.

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
Sewell, Jennifer	Principal	
Romero, David	Instructional Technology	
O'Neal, Gail	School Counselor	
Evans, Quinn	Assistant Principal	
Mason, Scotti	Teacher, K-12	
Wiley, Vera	Instructional Media	
Prout, Nancy	Instructional Coach	
Haupt, Jessica		

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	5	17	23	10	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	1	11	17	3	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	11	13	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	9	9	0	16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	11	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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

Monday 8/26/2019

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	5	5	3	4	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	1	13	11	12	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	11	3	9	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	27	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	3	5	2	7	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	5	5	3	4	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	1	13	11	12	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	11	3	9	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	27	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	3	5	2	7	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	42%	53%	57%	40%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	55%	58%	49%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	52%	53%	47%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	49%	57%	63%	40%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	60%	62%	40%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	52%	51%	35%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	54%	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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 (5)	17 (5)	23 (3)	10 (4)	21 (11)	17 (9)	93 (37)
One or more suspensions	1 (1)	11 (13)	17 (11)	3 (12)	7 (17)	5 (21)	44 (75)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	11 (11)	13 (3)	1 (9)	7 (9)	3 (2)	35 (34)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (13)	19 (27)	26 (33)	47 (73)

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	49%	56%	-7%	58%	-9%
	2018	37%	52%	-15%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	52%	-14%	58%	-20%
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	39%	51%	-12%	56%	-17%
	2018	27%	44%	-17%	55%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	55%	2%	62%	-5%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	58%	-8%	64%	-14%
	2018	42%	58%	-16%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	35%	55%	-20%	60%	-25%
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	55%	-6%	53%	-4%
	2018	36%	55%	-19%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
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	17	43	62	42	60	55	35				

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
BLK	30	45	67	41	52	58	31				
HSP	50	47		59	63						
MUL	52	57		57	50						
WHT	53	43		56	51		76				
FRL	41	46	64	48	51	59	52				
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	7	26	39	17	26	29	25				
BLK	23	24	33	35	41	36	23				
HSP	33	43		50	64						
MUL	40	29		57	50						
WHT	56	49		61	46		64				
FRL	34	32	30	46	42	31	37				
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	30	44	14	30	20	19				
BLK	29	45	47	29	34	38	23				
HSP	54			46							
MUL	55	62		52	42						
WHT	56	55		58	58		74				
FRL	36	48	49	34	36	33	32				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	366
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
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	56
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.

SWD ELA achievement was the lowest subgroup at 17% proficiency. We are trending upward from 7% the year prior to 17% this year. We made some instructional shifts to address the growth of students with disabilities and how they were served.

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

The only area with a decline was our WHT students in ELA achievement (-3); ELA LG (-6); and Math achievement (-5). We believe that the percentage change falls within the standard error of measure for each subgroup. We looked at individual students and will continue to monitor individual scores this year.

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 ELA (-28) and Math (-25) were the greatest gap areas as compared to the State average. Due to personnel issues with instructional staff multiple changes had to be made throughout the year. This includes dismissal of a teacher, reassigned two ESE teachers to better serve fifth grade students, three of the four teachers were teaching fifth grade for the first time.

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

We have three areas that showed 34% growth in our students: SWD in Math LG; BLK bottom quartile LG in ELA; and FRL bottom quartile LG in ELA. To achieve this growth we reallocated staff, dismissed instructional staff, monitored unit tests, retaught missed information immediately, implemented writing instruction with assistance from the DOE (Dr. Philicia Rich). We had target students what we focused on for learning, increased walk throughs, eliminated extraneous activities not related to academics.

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

The two areas of concern for us are the attendance below 90% (93) and our students who scored a Level 1 on the statewide assessments (47). The loss of instructional time is irreplaceable and moving students out of a Level 1 is difficult.

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

1. Increase ELA Proficiency with BLk students
2. Increase ELA Proficiency with SWD students
3. Increase Science Proficiency with BLK students
4. Increase Science Proficiency with SWD students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improving ELA proficiency for SWD and BLK students
Rationale	School wide data indicates 17% proficiency for SWD and BLK indicate 30% proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Increase SWD proficiency to 41%.</p> <p>Increase BLK proficiency to 41%.</p> <p>Close the gap between all subgroups.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meet with FIN to create a Master Schedule to create true inclusion classroom (K-4) with tiered support - Develop a Literacy team to address the needs of our BLK students and SWD -Tech assistants will meet with students to provide small group instruction using I-Ready tools for instruction - Quarterly Data Chats with students based on STAR/IReady/Unit tests and prior year FSA by cluster - Provide job embedded PD - Provide time for differentiated reading instruction for all students based on assessments on students current level - Provide intensive instruction on a daily basis the promotes the development of the various components of reading proficiency to students who show minimal progress after reasonable time in Tier II small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - To maximize human resources to provide intensive reading interventions based on data -
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create Master Schedule with Suzanne Day from FIN 2. Provide PD to dive deeply into class room data broken up by cluster to identify strengths and weaknesses 3. - Implement Multi-syllabic Routine daily 4. - Implement the Don Johnson Program 5. - Utilize Ready Workbooks for grades 2-5 6. SRA for low level readers 7. FSA style writing for grades 3-5 by Philicia Rich (DOE) 8. Tyner for ELA in grades K-2 9. Teach test taking skills by day 1. 10. Use Common Lit for standards based instruction in small groups 11. Words Their Way and FCRR for word work in Centers 12. Add Language component of SRA to Kindergarten 13. Daily listening and speaking for grades K-2 as precursor to writing 14. Collaborative planning with ESE and regular ed teacher. 15. Provide full time TA in inclusion classes in grades 3-5. 16. Weekly Guided Planning with CC for backwards design and unpacking standards 17. Tech Assistants in grades 1,2,3,4,and 5.

18. Admin data chats with students after each STAR/I-Ready assessment
19. Daily walk-throughs based on specific curriculum routines
20. Implement "Think - Alouds" in all grades
21. Identify Target students based on data.
22. Admin to participate Rensselaerville School Turn Around Training
23. 10 Day data meetings with District Specialists

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2	
Title	Improving Science Proficiency for SWD and BLK students
Rationale	School wide data indicates 35% proficiency for SWD and BLK indicate 31% proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase SWD proficiency to 41%. Increase BLK proficiency to 41%. Close the gap between all subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfi.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers to attend district rep meeting and Science PLCs Daily integration of ELA and Science, including writing using CIS lessons and leveled readers Whole Brain implementation Provide classroom libraries with a focus on science text. Assistive technology for below grade level readers Collaborative planning weekly Hands - On activities Multisyllabic Routines Word Walls Explicit word study instruction PD provided by district will allow teachers to collaborate and bring back standards based lesson plans and ideas. Whole Brain strategies meet the needs of diverse learners. Increased exposure to science topics during ELA block reinforces content. Assistive technology allows students to hear grade level and above science content. Collaborative planning allows for grade levels to share ideas. Hands - On activities to model the scientific processes. Multisyllabic Routine assists students in breaking apart Tier III vocabulary words to better comprehend science text Word walls with illustrations that are generated by students fosters vocabulary development Explicit word study instruction assists students with prefix, suffix, root word, greek and latin bases for improved comprehension and fluency in reading complex science text
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. Attend district PD 2. Teachers who were here last year will train new hires on Syn-aps. (whole brain movements and songs about content) 3. Plan ELA lessons based on science being taught 4. Receive training from FIN regarding Don Johnson and other assistive technology programs 5.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfi.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).

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.

Teachers communicate weekly and daily if necessary with parents using a checklist.
Website is updated regularly with news as well as a newsletter from admin.
Class DOJO is used as a PBS tool in all grade levels daily; parents can join the app.
Brentwood Facebook page updated regularly
New lighted/electronic marquis is updated regularly with news and reminders
Call outs through "school messenger" as needed
Rti meetings and parent conferences are conducted throughout the year.
Evening academic and non-academic events quarterly
Community volunteers regularly work with students and numbers are growing (5 currently)
Full time ESE teacher to support teachers and students with PBS initiatives

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.

Counseling is available for individual students and groups by School Counselor
Lakeview Overlay counselor 1 day a week.
Mentors are assigned to individual students as needed.
School counselor works closely with community services to meet the needs of students
Weekend food bags provided for students in need
Holiday gifts provided for families in need with community support
Our Technology Coordinator provides parent tours of our school as requested to help parents.

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

The Leadership Team will function as a Learning Community, Safety Committee, and an Action Committee that will help everyone at our school learn, implement, support, and share ideas related to school and student improvement.
Transition meeting held for ESE students going to Middle School

The Leadership Team will meet monthly to :

- *Review policies and procedures, discuss items to be shared from various curriculum departments at grade level meetings.
- *Develop and conduct professional development throughout the school year
- * Spend time analyzing school ELA, Math, Science, Behavior data(minors and majors), and attendance

data.

*Attend and support RTI/MTSS Tier meetings to ensure effective implementation of RtI/MTSS and ensure strategies are implemented with fidelity.

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.

Data closely monitored and resources (including personnel) targeted to students at risk.

Tech Assistants hired to work with low level non-ESE students

Self contained gifted cluster classes 3-5.

ESE inclusion classes in grades 3 and 4 have full time Teacher Assistants

Admin meets with Grade Level Chairs and teachers to discuss and problem solve curriculum needs and materials are purchased to meet those needs based on student data.

Curriculum Coordinator meets weekly with each grade level to review curriculum

Resources are signed out by teachers through Curriculum Coordinator.

We started an after school club called "Coding Club" to help 4th and 5th grade students learn to code programs on their own in preparation for the technology work field.

We implemented one to one learning by providing every 3rd -5th grade student with a chrome book laptop. Students were trained to use and care for it.

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

Career Day with Gifted cluster

Integrate nonfiction reading materials with a STEM focus.

Field Trips to science centers and music events

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improving ELA proficiency for SWD and BLK students	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improving Science Proficiency for SWD and BLK students	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00