

The School Board of Highlands County

Memorial 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	20

Memorial Elementary School

867 MEMORIAL DR, Avon Park, FL 33825

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~mes/>

Demographics

Principal: Sullyann Hinkle

Start Date for this Principal: 6/14/2019

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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (42%) 2014-15: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/8/2019.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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	20

Memorial Elementary School

867 MEMORIAL DR, Avon Park, FL 33825

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~mes/>

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	86%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/8/2019.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

"Memorial Elementary, together with parents, students, and community, will provide opportunities that prepare all students to be responsible and productive citizens."

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Empowering today's children to become tomorrow's leaders."

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
Floyd, Courtney	Principal	
Jackson, Kayla	Teacher, K-12	
Respress, Elizabeth	School Counselor	
Smith, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	
Kramer, Katina	Instructional Coach	
Hinkle, Sullyann	Assistant Principal	
Sodrel, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Reeves, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Watts, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Holt, Sherle	Teacher, K-12	

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	95	108	90	129	97	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	635
Attendance below 90 percent	18	18	12	18	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	4	5	2	10	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA or Math	18	33	4	22	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	40	18	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
	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	12	19	11	28	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	18	0	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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

43

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/2/2019

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	16	14	7	6	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	16	9	6	11	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in ELA or Math	64	19	18	37	36	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	59	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153

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	8	2	3	22	25	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	16	14	7	6	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	16	9	6	11	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in ELA or Math	64	19	18	37	36	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	59	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153

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	8	2	3	22	25	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	44%	50%	57%	51%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	54%	58%	58%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	49%	53%	41%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	57%	63%	60%	59%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	57%	62%	53%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	44%	51%	26%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	45%	53%	43%	47%	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	95 (0)	108 (0)	90 (0)	129 (0)	97 (0)	116 (0)	635 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	18 (16)	18 (14)	12 (7)	18 (6)	19 (6)	22 (13)	107 (62)
One or more suspensions	4 (16)	5 (9)	2 (6)	10 (11)	0 (7)	12 (12)	33 (61)
Course failure in ELA or Math	18 (64)	33 (19)	4 (18)	22 (37)	2 (36)	12 (12)	91 (186)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	40 (44)	18 (59)	35 (50)	93 (153)
	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	43%	50%	-7%	58%	-15%
	2018	46%	48%	-2%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	49%	-1%	58%	-10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	32%	45%	-13%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	38%	45%	-7%	56%	-18%
	2018	47%	47%	0%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
	2018	55%	61%	-6%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	60%	-6%	64%	-10%
	2018	58%	53%	5%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	61%	49%	12%	60%	1%
	2018	53%	52%	1%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	43%	-5%	53%	-15%
	2018	57%	50%	7%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
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	49	62	27	56	56	22				
ELL	21	70	90	38	73	63					
BLK	27	38	53	37	53	47	21				
HSP	40	57	68	52	68	56	41				
MUL	33	36		67	73						
WHT	63	57	64	71	66		66				

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
FRL	40	49	62	51	62	50	36				
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	21	32	16	28	41	19	27				
ELL	26	63	64	38	52	23					
ASN	73			91							
BLK	36	34	33	55	56	38	63				
HSP	35	55	42	48	60	26	43				
MUL	46			54							
WHT	51	44	40	66	54		70				
FRL	39	45	39	54	56	30	54				
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	26	42	36	24	27	31	40				
ELL	36	50	45	46	31	18					
BLK	38	69	67	54	51	20	14				
HSP	46	51	39	51	46	30	39				
MUL	60			70							
WHT	62	57		71	62	27	55				
FRL	48	58	42	57	50	25	43				

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	53
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42

Students With Disabilities	
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	58
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	54
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	52
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	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was our science achievement data. This year science proficiency was 41%. These students have struggled with ELA proficiency for several years (32% ELA proficiency in 2018 and 38% ELA proficiency in 2019). We did have a large, 6% increase from last school year to this school year, but have continued to address weaknesses in reading comprehension as a whole. We believe that this played a large role in the comprehension of the science assessment.

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

Science data declined from the previous year. However, this has not been a trend in the past. We believe that the main factor was the limited ELA proficiency in this group of students. Our math achievement data declined from 57% proficiency to 56% proficiency. This is not a large decline, however, we would have liked to see an increase in achievement.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

When comparing MES school data with the state, two areas stood out. These two areas are 3rd and 5th grade ELA proficiency. In third grade, MES students ELA achievement was 43%, which is 15 points below the state. In 5th grade, ELA proficiency was 38%, which is 18% below the state. Our 5th grade students have struggled in this area since they took the 3rd grade FSA assessment. We have continued to put interventions into place and have saw tremendous growth. Some of these gaps were extremely large. We are seeing these gaps begin to close, however, the FSA assessment didn't show this growth. An example would be of a 5th grade student who is reading on a first grade level, now reading on a second. This type of gain wouldn't necessarily show on a on-grade level assessment. We are continuing to review the 3rd grade data. We have several new interventions that we will be putting into practice this upcoming school year to increase their ELA proficiency. These interventions will take place on a school wide scale and will target areas in which students have gaps. We are hoping that this dedicated time will allow students to be able to close gaps and increase overall ELA proficiency.

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

Our ELA learning gains in our bottom 25% increased by 26%. Our math learning gains in our bottom 25% showed a 22% gain. Students in our bottom 25% have been an area of concern for MES this past school year. We placed a focus on these students and ensured that during PLC's students were being specifically discussed and plans for intervention were used with fidelity. We ensured that plans for intervention included specific areas of need for students, regardless of the current grade that a student is placed in. Students in this group received small group instruction by our school based support facilitators as well as classroom teachers. Our school reading coach worked closely with the district reading coach to ensure that student needs were being met and provided strategies on how to close gaps and increase achievement.

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

After reviewing the EWS data, two areas of concern were course failure and students with two or more indicators. Students who have a course failure in ELA or math, especially in grades K (64 students) and 3rd (37 students). Another area of concern would be the amount of students who have multiple indicators, especially in grade 3 (22 students) and grade 4 (25 students).

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

1. Increase ELA achievement (Currently 44% to 48%).
2. Increase ELA achievement in subgroup, African American (Currently 39% to 42%).
3. Increase science achievement (Currently 41% to 45%).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase ELA achievement (Currently 44% to 48%). Increase ELA learning gains from 52% to 60%.
Rationale	If we target student "gap" areas in ELA, then students will be able to read and comprehend grade level text.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	FSA/ELA achievement will increase to at least 48%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Courtney Floyd (floydc@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students will work 30 minutes, daily, in "WIN" groups. All hands will be on deck. Students will be given a phonics assessment to determine areas of strength and weakness. Students will then be grouped according to deficiencies. Groups will be small. All teachers, regardless of subject area, will work with a small group of a specific skill. School STEM and LCRT, support facilitators, and the ESOL para will all pull a group.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students will be working in small group instruction with highly qualified teachers on specific skill weaknesses. Students are receiving support on an individualized basis.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grade levels meet during PLCs and place students in correct groups. 2. Groups meet daily for 30 minutes. 3. Data is reviewed. 4. Student groups are fluid. 5.
Person Responsible	Courtney Floyd (floydc@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Increase ELA achievement in subgroup, African American (Currently 39% to 42%).
Rationale	If we target students in the African American subgroup who were not successful on the ELA FSA and provide specific small group remediation, then our students in this subgroup will increase their ELA proficiency on the 2020 FSA by 3%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	FSA/ELA data in the African American subgroup will increase by at least 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Courtney Floyd (floydc@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students in this subgroup will work with the support of a support facilitator during regular class instruction. Students will be provided interventions for skill deficiencies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students will be working in small group instruction with highly qualified teachers on specific skill weaknesses. Students are receiving support on an individualized basis.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Master Schedule provides time for support facilitators to work with small groups. 2. Support facilitators will collaborate with teachers on skill deficiencies. 3. Small groups instruction will take place 2-4 days/weekly. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Patricia Smith (smithp1@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Increase science achievement (Currently 41% to 45%).
Rationale	If teachers are focused on PLC groups, then all subject area data will increase, including science data from 41% to 45%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Student FCAT science proficiency will increase at least 4% by Spring 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Katina Kramer (kramerk@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher will work together in weekly PLCs to determine upcoming lessons, correlate those with the current standards, and to discuss and implement successful classroom strategies. Data will be reviewed to determine next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers attended the summer PLC conference and learned various ways to target students gap areas as well as enrich students through the PLC model.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Science teachers will meet weekly with the science coach. 2. Data will be reviewed and discussed. 3. Interventions/enrichment will be put into place. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Katina Kramer (kramerk@highlands.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).

The two main areas of focus for the 2019-2020 school year will be ELA proficiency, with a focus on the subgroup, African Americans. After reviewing our data our African American subgroup performed at 39% proficiency. This is our lowest performing subgroup. Because of the 39% proficiency this subgroup falls below the federal index. These two areas of focus impact student learning due to the fact that many of our students are struggling to read on grade level material. Our goal is to increase the overall ELA proficiency from 44% to 48% as well as increase the subgroup African American ELA proficiency from 39% to 42%.

We are forming a new tiered system to target all students in ELA instruction. We will be grouping students based on their need, for 30 minutes a day. All teachers will work with a small group at this time. By focusing on specific gaps that students have, we are hoping to close more gaps and be able to move more students to a proficient level. Students will be working with teachers who are trained and highly skilled in the specific area that they are targeting.

Sara Franza, MES reading coach, has worked very closely with Tina Sterling, the district reading coach, in developing a plan for this time. Mrs. Franza will be responsible for leading the PLC to ensure that students are placed in the correct groups, are assessed and moved to different groups as needed. All teachers will be trained on the specific skills that are needed to lead these groups.

We believe that by targeting specific skill deficits as well as providing highly effective instruction, students will begin to fill in gaps that have affected their fluency and reading comprehension. By meeting students where they are, students will be able to work at a level in which they can feel successful and continue to grow in their skills. In addition, we have developed a master schedule that supports this time. Grades K-2 are given a 30 minute common time as well as grades 3-5. This places a priority on this instruction and also allows all hands to be on deck. Support facilitators, coaches, and the ESOL paraprofessional will all be a part of this designated time.

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.

MES has an action team that is dedicated to providing rich family engagement. Many of these activities (Burgers and Board Games, The Night Before Christmas, Reading nights) provide parents with an opportunity to have fun with their children and become comfortable and familiar with the school at the same time. We are hoping that by involving the parents and having them come in and have fun with their children, they will become more involved in school. We also hold events such as Dad's Day, Muffins with Mom, Awards Ceremonies, and Performances where parents are invited to be a part of their child's success!

Our School Advisory Council (SAC) is an elected representative body comprised of parents, teachers, and community partners. Parents elected to the SAC membership represent the racial/ethnic and socio-economic demographic groups of our school. Even though there are elected members of SAC, all parents are invited to attend our SAC meetings.

The SAC committee and parents are encouraged to participate by reviewing the Parent Family Engagement Plan (PFEP), making suggestions, voting, and approving the PFEP. The Home School Compact is also brought before the parents through the SAC to review, revise, vote, and approve the Compact. SAC also approves the Title 1 Parent Involvement budget in the fall at its first meeting. Communication is provided to parents in Spanish and English for example, progress reports, report cards, Home School Compact, Connect Ed calls and other important information that needs to be relayed from school to the home. Parents, community members, and school staff work together to make decisions regarding how Title 1 parent involvement monies will be used and how to promote student academic success.

Parents are welcomed and notified of events in advance in a timely manner through our newsletter, notes in backpacks, Connect Ed, and flyers.

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.

Re-evaluations and transition staffings are held each spring for students transitioning from ESE Pre-K to Kindergarten programs. Families are also notified about the staffings and are also encouraged to have

their children participate in ESY and VPK at participating elementary schools.

At MES we support our students' social-emotional needs through various approaches (school social worker, guidance counselor, school psychologist, mentoring program, Youth and Family). We utilize our guidance counselor to provide immediate assistance. When unique situations arise or additional services are needed beyond the scope of our guidance office, we refer our students to our mental health therapist. We accept mental health referrals from teachers, students, parents and staff in order to address student needs. Said individuals can complete a referral form in order to provide our mental health therapist preliminary information.

Once a month our threat assessment team (administration, guidance counselor, psychologist, mental health therapist) meets to discuss students who have needed or need services to help meet their social-emotional needs.

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

At the end of the school year, teachers complete two rubrics to help place students in their appropriate class. Grade level teams also provide input based on the needs of students. Kindergarten parents are able to enroll their students during the summer and have the opportunity to tour the campus. The kindergarten assessment is administered to most students before the beginning of the school year to ensure appropriate placement and minimize class changes. Our guidance counselor meets with the middle school guidance counselor during transition meetings. Concerns and strategies that have been used and have shown student success are shared. At the beginning of the year, our threat assessment teams to discuss student transitions across grade levels and their placements. If additional information needs to be shared among schools, our school social worker shares that information with the new school.

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.

Title I Part C, Migrant

Provides services to migrant students (PreK-12) and their families. The primary goal of the Migrant program is to improve academic performance of migrant students, and provide health and guidance to them. The Migrant Early Childhood Program serves 4 year old children in a full time preschool program, focusing on readiness activities. Parent involvement and education is an integral part of the Migrant Program.

Title I Part A

Will provide funds to all district Title 1 schools, in a school wide project format, to target academic assistance to all students, professional development for teachers and parent involvement activities. This grant is also the funding source for implementing the requirements of NCLB which have not been waived by the FLDOE's waiver.

Nutrition Programs

LEA participates in the federal Free/Reduced lunch program and the free breakfast for all students program. Snack is also provided for afterschool care and afterschool tutoring programs. Summer food programs are provided at various school sites and community locations. The USDA fruit and vegetable

grant will also provided at Fred Wild Elementary School.

VPK

These programs are provided and facilitated through the district each summer at a school location in each community for families of all eligible incoming kindergarten students not previously served in the private sector.

Homeless

Students Services coordinates with Title 1 Part A to provide resources (school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education(FAPE).

Migrant Parent Advisory

The Migrant Parent Advisory is actively involved in reviewing parent educational activities and strategies, as well as student instructional programs.

Exceptional Students Education

This Parent Advisory Council is actively involved in reviewing parent educational activities and strategies.

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

Memorial Elementary has visitors from the community come to our school, visit classrooms and speak with students about their careers. We also have partnerships with businesses in our community (Bill Jarrett Ford, Wells, J&J Steel Products Lawn Division, All About Buildings).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase ELA achievement (Currently 44% to 48%). Increase ELA learning gains from 52% to 60%.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase ELA achievement in subgroup, African American (Currently 39% to 42%).	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase science achievement (Currently 41% to 45%).	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00