

Escambia County School District

Pleasant Grove 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	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Pleasant Grove Elementary School

10789 SORRENTO RD, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Owens Braggs

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (51%) 2014-15: C (52%)
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	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Pleasant Grove Elementary School

10789 SORRENTO RD, Pensacola, FL 32507

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	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

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

Our mission at Pleasant Grove Elementary is to encourage learning and creativity that will prepare our students for success and lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Pleasant Grove is to promote the recognition of positive behaviors and academic success that aligns with the school-wide expectation to create a positive learning environment encouraging students, teachers, staff and parents to exhibit school and community pride.

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
Mullen, Pamela	Principal	The role of the Leadership team is meet monthly with admin to monitor progress of goals.
Roy, Kaylin	Teacher, K-12	
Schultheis, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Rabin, Jackie	Teacher, K-12	
Tindell, Sunday	Assistant Principal	
Crigler, Lori	Teacher, ESE	
Larsen, Carol	Teacher, K-12	
Terrell, Kayleigh	Teacher, K-12	
Maloy, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Dowd, Cindy	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	77	75	96	88	100	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	19	12	20	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	3	6	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	32	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	2	0	3	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	8	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

41

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/15/2019

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	3	3	5	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	5	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	1	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	32	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	3	3	5	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	5	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	1	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	32	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	56%	53%	57%	55%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	55%	58%	53%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	52%	53%	40%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	57%	63%	54%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	60%	62%	38%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	51%	22%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	54%	53%	48%	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	77 (0)	75 (0)	96 (0)	88 (0)	100 (0)	96 (0)	532 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 (3)	10 (3)	19 (5)	12 (3)	20 (2)	14 (4)	82 (20)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	2 (5)	1 (3)	2 (5)	6 (4)	5 (8)	16 (25)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	4 (4)	3 (1)	6 (4)	4 (5)	5 (3)	22 (17)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (7)	32 (32)	23 (37)	62 (76)

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	58%	56%	2%	58%	0%
	2018	46%	52%	-6%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	55%	51%	4%	56%	-1%
	2018	48%	44%	4%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	55%	-3%	62%	-10%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	58%	5%	64%	-1%
	2018	62%	58%	4%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	53%	55%	-2%	60%	-7%
	2018	48%	52%	-4%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	65%	55%	10%	53%	12%
	2018	61%	55%	6%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	29	53	53	24	64	55	25				

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
ASN	64			64	80						
BLK	40	56	36	33	52	63	46				
HSP	71	67		57	67		58				
MUL	59	43		63	59		83				
WHT	60	62	71	66	67	67	81				
FRL	50	55	55	52	61	55	65				
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	29	29	13	30	38	24					
ASN	55			58							
BLK	34	40	30	31	45	41	50				
HSP	50	47		67	60						
MUL	71	58		77	63						
WHT	58	46	19	64	57	50	74				
FRL	46	42	32	53	52	41	64				
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	16	27	21	16	20	19	33				
ASN	73			73							
BLK	37	41	45	36	34	30	22				
HSP	57	43		62	50		60				
MUL	76	79		73	43		60				
WHT	57	53	33	56	38	12	57				
FRL	51	52	38	50	35	25	42				

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	60
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	419
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	69
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
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	64
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	61
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	
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	68
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	56
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.

In 2019, the component that showed the lowest performance was our Math achievement maintaining at 56% proficiency. Math achievement cohort comparisons showed an increase of 14% in 4th grade and a decrease of 9% in 5th grade. Students with disabilities achieving proficiency decreased from 30% to 24% in 2019. Even though our ELA achievement was also 56% we showed a gain of 4 points as compared to 2018.

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

In 2019, we showed growth in all components with the exception of Math Achievement. We maintained 56% of our students scoring proficiency. Math achievement cohort comparisons showed an increase of 14% in 4th grade and a decrease of 9% in 5th grade. Students with disabilities achieving proficiency decreased from 30% to 24% in 2019. One factor that contributed to this decline is a more intensive focus on lower quartile students. Another factor is lack of number sense.

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 component with the greatest gap between school and state was our 3rd grade Math Achievement with the school scoring 52% and the state scoring 62%. This is a 10 point difference, which is a decrease of 3 percentage points from 2018.

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

In 2019, the component with the most improvement was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. In 2018, 29% of our students in the lowest quartile made learning gains. In 2019 that number rose to 59% a 30 point jump. Actions that had a positive effect on this outcome include: SIP goal committees focused on ELA proficiency and learning gains; i-Ready online individualized practice and tutorials; Learning gain goal setting in STAR with progress monitoring for lowest quartile.

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

One area of concern is the percentage of students with attendance below 90%. 89/532 students fall into this area (roughly 17%) We will continue to monitor attendance and conduct attendance meetings with parents.

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

1. SWD for ESSA
2. SWD Math Achievement
3. Math Achievement
4. 5th grade cohort achievement
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	SWD Math Proficiency
Rationale	This area of focus was identified as a critical need because our 2018 percentile was 30% and the 2019 percentile decreased to 24%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The desired goal for the 2019-2020 school year will be 34%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lori Crigler (lcrigler@escambia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Identify specific students based on benchmark assessments (K-5). Monthly school improvement committee meetings to analyze district benchmark data and develop action plans based on that data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Developing this specific list of students will help provide school-wide intentional focus.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Form school improvement goal committees that meet monthly. 2. Analyze district and state benchmark assessments to identify those students with the highest need. 3. Collaborate and develop strategies using Thinking Maps and other research based problem solving techniques.
Person Responsible	Lori Crigler (lcrigler@escambia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	Math achievement cohort comparisons showed an increase of 14% in 4th grade and a decrease of 9% in 5th grade.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The desired goal for the 2019-2020 school year will be 61% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Alice Downs (adowns@escambia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Identify specific students based on benchmark assessments (K-5). Monthly school improvement committee meetings to analyze district benchmark data and develop action plans based on that data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Developing this specific list of students will help provide school-wide intentional focus.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Form school improvement goal committees that meet monthly. 2. Analyze district and state benchmark assessments to identify those students with the highest need. 3. Collaborate and develop strategies using Thinking Maps and other research based problem solving techniques.
Person Responsible	Alice Downs (adowns@escambia.k12.fl.us)
#3	
Title	ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	This area of focus was identified because ultimately we would like to see our students reach 100% learning gains but realistically our goal is to achieve consistent growth.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The desired goal for the 2019-2020 school year will be to go from 59% to 64%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Heather Macdonald (hmacdonald@escambia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Identify specific students based on benchmark assessments (K-5). Monthly school improvement committee meetings to analyze district benchmark data and develop action plans based on that data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Developing this specific list of students will help provide school-wide intentional focus.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Form school improvement goal committees that meet monthly. 2. Analyze district and state benchmark assessments to identify those students with the highest need. 3. Collaborate and develop strategies using Thinking Maps and other research based problem solving techniques.
Person Responsible	Heather Macdonald (hmacdonald@escambia.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	This area of focus was identified because our 2018 percentile was 64% and the 2019 percentile was 69%. We want to continue this upward trend. This area of focus impacts student learning and success by putting specific attention on this particular subject in order to ensure proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The intended outcome for our school is to increase science achievement from 69% to 74%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kayleigh Terrell (kterrell@escambia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	School improvement committee will focus on 3rd, 4th and 5th grade School-Net assessment data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on our previous data, this will be an obtainable goal.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Form school improvement goal committees that meet monthly. 2. Analyze district and state benchmark assessments to identify those students with the highest need. 3. Collaborate and develop strategies using Thinking Maps and other research based problem solving techniques.
Person Responsible	Kayleigh Terrell (kterrell@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).

NA

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.

A written Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) in collaboration with parents, community stakeholders, and school personnel responsible for implementing the plan. The PFEP will assess the previous year's PFEP results and current needs. The plan will outline goals, strategies and activities to better communicate with families and will focus on building the capacity of parents to address the needs of all students, in particular those most at-risk of not meeting challenging State academic standards. (SWD) PGE offers conferences at times convenient for parents, positive phone calls home, etc to build that positive relationship. A Family-School Compact will also be developed jointly with parents and other stakeholders. The school's Title I budget will directly support the PFE.

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.

ESSA requires title i schools to address the following, which will be school specific:

Counseling, school-based mental health programs, specialized instructional support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas.

Pleasant Grove Elementary has a guidance counselor available to work with students in groups or individually. She works with parents by identifying outside services that are available.

A mental health counselor comes twice a week to be available to work with students with needs.

Pleasant Grove Elementary also was awarded a DoDEA grant to help meet the Social Emotional needs of students. We have an Military Family Life Counselor to work with military students. The teachers have also been trained with Capturing Kids Hearts and Anchored for Life.

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

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 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 A

Academic support is provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through purchasing a part time technology coordinator, PBIS behavior coach and staff development materials.

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: SWD Math Proficiency	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Achievement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00