Pine Meadow Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pine Meadow Elementary School

10001 OMAR AVE, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Dawn Morris R

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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)	84%
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 (57%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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, <u>click here</u>.

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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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

Pine Meadow Elementary School

10001 OMAR AVE, Pensacola, FL 32534

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	72%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

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

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 School Mission at Pine Meadow Elementary is to provide high levels of learning in a culture of collaboration and respect between students, faculty, staff, and parents. We will achieve and gain a sense of purpose through hard work, kindness, and high expectations in a safe and positive learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision for Pine Meadow Elementary is to be an environment that encourages the learning and development of the individual student in all phases of academic, physical, creative, and emotional experiences by providing a positive school climate. Pine Meadow will be a place where not only students learn, but educators learn and refine their skills, and where parents learn skills to help their child learn. A place where all stakeholders are involved in making a positive difference in the lives of students by preparing them for lifelong learning.

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
Greenberg, Elizabeth	Principal	Principal
Watts, Jay	Assistant Principal	Asst. Principal
Garrison, Pamela	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team Grade Chair
Broadwater, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Team Leader
Chism, Heidi	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Team Leader
whiddon, kristin	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Team Leader
Box, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Leader
Dawson, Susan	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Team Leader
Harris, Takara	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Team Leader

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	123	113	110	103	108	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	669
Attendance below 90 percent	7	14	12	12	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	4	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	2	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	5	7	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
44

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/20/2019

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	6	11	10	13	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	6	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	11	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	3	0	1	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	6	11	10	13	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	6	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	11	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	3	0	1	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	64%	53%	57%	67%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	55%	58%	59%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	53%	46%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	67%	57%	63%	67%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	60%	62%	57%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	52%	51%	50%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	54%	53%	56%	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	123 (0)	113 (0)	110 (0)	103 (0)	108 (0)	112 (0)	669 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 (6)	14 (11)	12 (10)	12 (13)	15 (7)	15 (16)	75 (63)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (2)	4 (3)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (4)	5 (6)	4 (2)	2 (1)	2 (0)	3 (1)	16 (14)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (1)	15 (11)	15 (31)	36 (43)

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	71%	56%	15%	58%	13%
	2018	70%	52%	18%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	52%	17%	58%	11%
	2018	54%	51%	3%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	45%	51%	-6%	56%	-11%
	2018	66%	44%	22%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	55%	12%	62%	5%
	2018	72%	54%	18%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	58%	22%	64%	16%
	2018	67%	58%	9%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	53%	55%	-2%	60%	-7%
	2018	72%	52%	20%	61%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	55%	1%	53%	3%
	2018	65%	55%	10%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	37	47	50	43	37	21	26				

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	43	43	50	48	49	29	33				
HSP	60	54		72	46		64				
MUL	79	80		65	69						
WHT	71	60	42	72	62	48	62				
FRL	60	54	48	60	53	39	43				

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	26	28	19	47	34	10	19				
BLK	42	41	16	48	46	21	50				
HSP	74	53		74	68						
MUL	74	57		74	57		70				
WHT	67	48	31	76	69	48	68				
FRL	56	42	24	68	61	35	52				

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	24	23	29	42	39	27	8				
BLK	45	49	42	39	45	35	7				
HSP	79	73		79	91						
MUL	70	63		78	63		60				
WHT	72	61	48	73	58	56	66				
FRL	57	52	42	58	44	35	48				

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	57
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	42
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	59
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	73
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	60
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.

School Data-Lowest performance is gains within Math Lowest 25th Percentile. Although this showed a slight increase from the previous year overall in grades 3-5, 41% is significantly below our other areas and below both the District and State. Math overall showed a decline in proficiency percentage and percent of students making gains.

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

Data component that showed the greatest decline was science proficiency, although it is still above state and district average-decreased 9 percentage points from the past year 66% to 57%. Data within 5th grade scores showed large declines for both ELA and Math proficiency from prior year scores (same grade and cohort).

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.

Math lowest quartile gain performance has the largest gap between school scores and state. 41% school, 51% state

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

Largest improvement was in lowest quartile scores for ELA gain performance.

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

Level 1 on State Assessment in 5th Grade and Attendance below 90%

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

1. Increasing gains within the Lowest 25th Percentile Math
2. Improving proficiency within SWD subgroup for Math
3. Increasing gains within Lowest 25th Percentile ELA
4. Improved proficiency within SWD subgroup for ELA
5. Science Proficiency Increase

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Math Lowest 25th Percentile and SWD Subgroup
Rationale	Lowest area of performance (41%) as well a largest gap between school and state performance (-10%). Subgroup of students with disbabilities below 40.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the percentage of students having learning gains/or proficiency within math lowest 25th percentile and subgroup of SWD to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Extend mathematics academic learning time proportionate to the student's academic needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	All students receive 60 minutes of math instruction daily. Lowest 25th percentile students will require not only more time for instruction but strategic and targeted based on their needs.

Action Step

Description	1. Targeted small groups will be identified and assigned specific curriculum targets based on progress monitoring data through out the school year. 2. Data will be reviewed after each progress monitoring period and small group and instructional targets will be adjusted based on current data. 3. Walkthroughs during small group math instruction to calibrate the lens for math expectations. 4. Tutoring for specific groups of students based on students will be offered. 5. Curriculum Night with Math Focus offered in the fall for parents, students, and teachers.
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfl.us)

#2	
Title	Science Proficiency
Rationale	Largest decline from prior year from 66% to 57%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase percentage of students achieving science proficiency to 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use of CER writing within science instruction to justify understanding of science standards after experiments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Moving from knowledge of content to understanding and application of knowledge.
Action Step	
Description	1. Will review data with teachers to ensure curriculum is aligned to standards and remediation occurs as necessary. 2. Set up and ensure use of STEAM labs to enhance the hands on experience and science lab instruction. 3. Utilize CER writing within Science Instruction
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfl.us)

#3	
Title	ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	Although there has been growth in this area, school is performing just at the state average. Students below proficiency need to make gains each year and those at proficiency need to maintain and show growth.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the percentage of students making learning gains in Reading/ELA to 65% with an increased focus on Lowest 25th percentile and SWD subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Plan ELA academic learning time and rigor of activities proportionate to the student's academic needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure needs of students are being met through small group instruction. Strengthen Tier 1 and utilize decision tree to determine evidence based interventions.
Action Step	
Description	1. Targeted small groups will be identified and assigned specific curriculum targets based on progress monitoring data through out the school year. 2. Data will be reviewed after each progress monitoring period and small group and instructional targets will be adjusted based on current data. 3. Walkthroughs during small group ELA instruction to ensure curriculum is aligned to rigor of standards/expectations. 4. Tutoring for specific groups of students based on data will be offered. 5. Accelerated Reader School Wide Initiative enhanced.
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Greenberg (egreenberg@ecsdfl.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).

Social Emotional Learning through Sanford Harmony Kits, and Suite 360 modules to improve relationships and emotional well-being while decreasing the number of tantrums, and outbursts in the primary grades.
Improve Tier1 instruction through UDL strategies with increased focus on student engagement, and cooperative learning strategies.

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. The PFEP will be reviewed by District Title 1 office and the reviewed plan will be disseminated to parents and stakeholders. A family-School Compact will also be developed jointly with parents and other stakeholders. The school's Title 1 budget will directly support the PFEP.

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.

The Pine Meadow guidance counselor is in charge of our mentoring program as well as tutoring program and is the contact person fo a variety of other student services including beginning the MTSS process and screening for gifted. The counselor schedules visits with music classes the first few weeks of school so student will recognize her face and initiate bullying prevention classes. She meets with students that teachers and parents may refer, as well as students that request to meet with her. The counselor also promotes a character trait of the month, highlighting the trait, by talking and reading about the trait, posting examples on a bulletin board.
All classroom teachers have a Sanford Harmony Kit and use the lessons integrated throughout their instruction.
Teachers have received professional development on Suite 360 and have access to assigned modules, as well as guidance counselors and administrators. Teachers understand process for referrals to guidance for students that are having difficulties with their emotions. Guidance counselor and administration can make referrals to overlay counselor if needs of student goes beyond our capabilities. This overlay counselor works with students once a week. Also, we utilize mentoring through Navy Federal and other volunteers ready to assist individual students who are recommended for the mentoring

program by classroom teachers. We also recommend outgoing 5th grade students for middle school mentors based on their needs.

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

At Pine Meadow Elementary prior to the beginning of the school year kindergarten teachers have an orientation that is specifically for kindergarteners and their parents. Teachers also complete a brief screening all kindergarteners on that day.
The Head Start program has one unit located on our school campus. We work with the Head Start program to provide pre-kindergarten students an opportunity to visit kindergarten classrooms and tour the school prior to the end of the school year. Parents are invited to come and register their children and receive information (transportation, breakfast etc.) that will assist in the transition to our school. Additionally voluntary pre-kindergarten programs are available through several private providers serving our school. These providers include Miss Kathy's, Malena's Preschool and Marcus Point Baptist Church Preschool.
For outgoing fifth graders middle schools send a representative to talk with each fifth grade class about middle school, identify important information and field any questions students may have.

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.

The leadership team meets on a regular basis to engage in the following activities: review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions and practice new processes and skills. The team will facilitate the process of building consensus and making decisions about implementation. The team will provide data on Tier 1, 2 and 3 targets, academic, behavioral and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; set clear expectations of instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitate the development of a system approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining and Summarizing); and align processes and procedures.

Title I, Part A - Academic support is provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through a part time tutor, remediation software programs and material.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) monies are being used for remedial material and software to use when working with academically struggling students.

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 graduations.

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).

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: Math Lowest 25th Percentile and SWD Subgroup	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Proficiency	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00