
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

Bellview Elementary School

4425 BELLVIEW AVE, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Christine Jenkins L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2016

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 (42%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (47%) 2014-15: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Bellview Elementary School

4425 BELLVIEW AVE, Pensacola, FL 32526

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	53%

School Grades History

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

Empowering all learners to reach their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bellview Elementary will be a place where the entire school is valued and contributes to a flexible, caring, and personalized learning environment for all.

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
Groff, Melissa	Principal	
Jackson, Shannan	School Counselor	
Carroll, Laura	Assistant Principal	
Cowan, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Brown, Sandra	Teacher, K-12	
Eubanks, Lisa	Teacher, ESE	
Baggett, Angelyn	Teacher, K-12	
Fowler, Monica	Teacher, K-12	
Kivlan, Marsha	Teacher, K-12	
Long, Christina	Teacher, K-12	
Ramsey, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Sharp, Dana	Teacher, K-12	
Yannucci, Paul	Teacher, K-12	
Coker, Laura	Instructional Coach	

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	87	85	92	116	106	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	12	31	17	25	24	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	3	3	6	11	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	3	12	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	34	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
	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	1	6	2	11	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	3	12	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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

39

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/11/2019

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	12	30	19	19	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	1	3	12	4	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	8	6	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	6	5	6	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	12	30	19	19	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	1	3	12	4	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	8	6	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	6	5	6	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	47%	53%	57%	43%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	58%	43%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	52%	53%	31%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	40%	57%	63%	45%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	39%	60%	62%	48%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	19%	52%	51%	37%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	54%	53%	42%	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	87 (0)	85 (0)	92 (0)	116 (0)	106 (0)	104 (0)	590 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	12 (12)	31 (30)	17 (19)	25 (19)	24 (23)	29 (20)	138 (123)
One or more suspensions	3 (1)	3 (3)	6 (12)	11 (4)	6 (3)	10 (6)	39 (29)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	8 (5)	3 (8)	12 (6)	5 (4)	5 (7)	33 (30)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (14)	34 (22)	39 (36)	85 (72)
	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	45%	56%	-11%	58%	-13%
	2018	56%	52%	4%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	52%	-4%	58%	-10%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	41%	51%	-10%	56%	-15%
	2018	35%	44%	-9%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	42%	55%	-13%	62%	-20%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	58%	-15%	64%	-21%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	29%	55%	-26%	60%	-31%
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	55%	-14%	53%	-12%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%
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 2017-18
SWD	16	39	45	21	30	18	13				

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	29	43	47	24	31	16	27				
HSP	48	58		43	42						
MUL	52	64		52	47						
WHT	56	60	60	46	41	26	52				
FRL	40	51	53	35	34	21	41				
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	14	27	25	22	23	24	6				
BLK	33	32	30	41	40	25	28				
HSP	35	31		35	31						
MUL	54	48		52	50		45				
WHT	52	44	42	60	58	65	65				
FRL	43	47	50	47	51	47	34				
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	8	21	29	8	21	13					
BLK	33	35	23	34	42	36	26				
HSP	26	59		30	53		17				
MUL	38	38		41	36		33				
WHT	54	50	29	54	54	39	60				
FRL	37	39	28	41	44	37	40				

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	42
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	296
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	
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	31
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	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	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	49
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Learning Gains of the lowest quartile of Math students showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors involve a lack of intervention time dedicated in the master schedule for math instruction as there was for ELA. There was an overall lack of "knowing" who these students are to connect with them. There was a shift in the test design from CBT to PBT and our teachers did not spend the necessary time teaching how to take an assessment that was primarily decimal-gridded response.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is our learning gains of our lowest quartile students in Mathematics. This number went from 41% to 19%. Along with the contributing factors listed above, our ESE instruction lacked rigor and fidelity to schedule.

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.

The Math lowest quartile learning gains shows the greatest gap when compared to the state average, with a gap of 32%. The factors are the same as those that contributed to section a and b above.

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

Our overall ELA learning gains showed the most improvement. We implement What I Need (WIN) time, providing all students with interventions within data driven flexible groups.

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

Overall Attendance

The number of students scoring a level one on statewide assessments.

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

1. Math
2. Level 1 and ESE students
3. Rigor of Instruction
4. Attendance
5. Behavior

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math
Rationale	Current data shows that Math was an area of deficit as well as our greatest area of decline from the previous year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students will demonstrate an increase of 10% in mathematics proficiency, mathematics learning gains, as well as learning gains of the lowest quartile students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melissa Groff (mgroff@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will provide small group instruction, targeting individual needs demonstrated from common formative assessments. Professional learning communities will be specifically focused on power standards and students' progress toward mastery of these power standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	After analyzing current data and comparing to previous years as well as comparing our data to similar schools, our deficit in math achievement is our greatest need. Bellview's school improvement plan is centered around Professional Learning Communities. We chose this strategy after our leadership team completed a book study on School Improvement for ALL. (Kramer & Schuhl). Our purpose is to ensure high levels of learning for ALL students. We believe that collaborative efforts will improve learning and we plan to focus on results.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rigorous Instruction 2. Common Formative Assessment 3. PLC 4. Plan to flex group / remediate 5. Repeat
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2	
Title	Academic performance of level 1 and ESE students
Rationale	An achievement gap exists between our ESE/level 1 students and proficient students. By focusing on this area, we hope to narrow the gap between these groups.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	60% of our ESE and Level 1 students will gain a sublevel in reading and math, as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melissa Groff (mgroff@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Bellview Elementary will implement Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) consistently across all grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The implementation of PLCs will result in a common viable curriculum, proficiency standards, a common language, and data-driven collaboration which will impact student learning.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common formative assessments will be used and analyzed by grade levels in core content areas 2. WIN Time- ELA intervention block 3. Math Matters Time- Math Intervention block 4. Report card pick-up nights will occur each quarter 5. All ESE students and all students scoring below the 25th percentile on Star assessments will receive phone calls home and specific information related to skill deficits and strategies for helping at home
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Behavior of boys
Rationale	The data indicates that our boys have twice as many referrals as girls and our African American boys represent more than 50% of our office discipline referrals. The majority of these come from students in a low SES status. By focusing on the behavior of boys, we will decrease time out of class and increase performance for boys, African American students, and our low SES students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will decrease the suspension of boys by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Paul Yannucci (pyannucci@escambia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue our implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention Support and related strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	PBIS is the foundation of positive relationships and consistent expectations, which will set the stage for tiered interventions targeted toward specific students and their needs, increasing academic focus and success.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Soaring Eagles- a club for boys with a history of behavior intervention needs that focuses on social skills, relationships, and community outreach. 2. Breakfast with a Mentor 3. Sanford Harmony Curriculum 4. Student-to-Student mentoring 5. Suite 360
Person Responsible	Paul Yannucci (pyannucci@escambia.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	Rigor
Rationale	Tier 1 instruction will become more rigorous by intentionally increasing depth of knowledge of core standards. To increase proficiency and learning gains of every student, but will specifically and strategically grow our subgroups that are our economically disadvantaged population, as well as the African American population of students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	55% of all students on every grade level will meet proficiency on grade level common formative assessments (CFA's.)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laura Coker (lcoker@escambia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Bellview Elementary will implement Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) consistently across all grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our school and teams need to spend time examining the two critical beliefs about learning: (1) all students can learn at high levels, and (2) teams must take collective responsibility for the learning of all students.
Action Step	
Description	<p>1. We will use the following to implement Common Formative Assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -UDL strategies and Blooms/Webbs Depth of Knowledge -district frameworks -deconstructed standards -Test Item Specification <p>2. Groff and Carroll walk-through form</p>
Person Responsible	Laura Coker (lcoker@escambia.k12.fl.us)

#5	
Title	EWS-Attendance
Rationale	Attendance is imperative to student learning and the majority of students with 2 or more EWS flags have attendance as an indicator too.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will increase the number of students with 90% or higher attendance from 77% to 82% by the end of the 2019/2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shannan Jackson (sjackson4@escambia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will implement positive reinforcement of good attendance school-wide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Historically, Bellview has not implemented a positive reinforcement for good attendance, research shows that Positive Behavior Supports are effective.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School-wide attendance plan- Each class will receive a letter for each day they have perfect attendance to spell "Perfect Attendance". Once they spell perfect attendance the class spells perfect attendance they get to go to the concession stand and pick a reward. 2. Friday Dance- Friday mornings after the announcements students will get to dance in the hallway for one minute if they had perfect attendance for the week.
Person Responsible	Shannan Jackson (sjackson4@escambia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

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.

Bellview Elementary School receives TITLE I, Part A funds and is developing a written Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) that establishes our expectations for parent and family engagement. This plan will describe how we will carry out the programs, activities, and procedures in accordance with

the definitions in Section 8101 of ESEA. This plan is developed jointly and agreed upon with the families of children participating in TITLE I, Part A programs.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

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

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

Title I, Part A

Academic support is provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through comprehensive MTSS systems which include an instructional coach and a remediation teacher paid through Title I funds. We are implementing What I Need time allowing behavior, academic, and social supports to be put into place for students in need.

Title I, Part C Migrant

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

Title I, Part D

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

Title II

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

Title III-ELL

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

Title IX- Homeless

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

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

NA

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

NA

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Academic performance of level 1 and ESE students	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Behavior of boys	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Rigor	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: EWS-Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00