Chiefland Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chiefland Elementary School

1205 NW 4TH AVE, Chiefland, FL 32626

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

Demographics

Principal: Amy Webber

Start Date for this Principal: 1/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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 (52%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (41%) 2014-15: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 is pending approval by the Levy 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

Chiefland Elementary School

1205 NW 4TH AVE, Chiefland, FL 32626

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

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 PK-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	29%

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 Levy County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The staff, parents and community work together to ensure the success of all students while cultivating their dreams for tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will be known forever by the tracks we leave.

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
Homan, Michael	Principal	Active participant/leader, to encourage communication between faculty and staff; facilitate the problem solving process; authorize the implementation of ides and the use of resources in the process. Develop the agenda for each leadership team meeting.
Watkins, Aimee	Teacher, K-12	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.
Gore, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Active participant/leader, to encourage communication between faculty and staff; facilitate the problem solving process; authorize the implementation of ides and the use of resources in the process.
Wiggins, Salinda	Assistant Principal	Active participant/leader, to encourage communication between faculty and staff; facilitate the problem solving process; authorize the implementation of ides and the use of resources in the process.
Barron, Michelle	School Counselor	Help facilitate the problem-solving process and to provide input regarding services and resources that may be available to the team.
Beauchamp, Randi	Instructional Coach	Help facilitate the problem-solving process and to provide input regarding services and resources that may be available to the team. Help to determine professional development needs and supports for teachers.
Mitchell, Aimee	Dean	Help facilitate the problem-solving process and to provide input regarding services and resources that may be available to the team.
Rogers, April	Teacher, K-12	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.
Hardee, Dorie	Teacher, K-12	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.
Boyd, Erin	Teacher, K-12	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.
Rawlins, Heather	Instructional Coach	Help facilitate the problem-solving process and to provide input regarding services and resources that may be available to the team. Help to determine professional development needs and supports for teachers.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones, Christy	Teacher, ESE	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.
Bailey, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.
Agnoli, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.
Wilson, Kelli	Teacher, K-12	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.
Allen, Taelor	School Counselor	Help facilitate the problem-solving process and to provide input regarding services and resources that may be available to the team.

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	117	124	118	102	127	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	690
Attendance below 90 percent	0	51	40	53	43	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
One or more suspensions	0	4	9	11	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	10	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	34	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	7	7	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	5	5	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
48

Date this data was collected or last updated
Sunday 8/25/2019

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	42	29	26	25	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170
One or more suspensions	7	7	12	11	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Course failure in ELA or Math	18	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	36	44	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132

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	121	94	112	94	86	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	628

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	42	29	26	25	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170
One or more suspensions	7	7	12	11	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Course failure in ELA or Math	18	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	36	44	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132

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	121	94	112	94	86	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	628

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	48%	49%	57%	44%	49%	55%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	58%	59%	58%	52%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	55%	53%	56%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	58%	63%	52%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	64%	62%	60%	52%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	42%	51%	44%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	50%	53%	48%	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	117 (0)	124 (0)	118 (0)	102 (0)	127 (0)	102 (0)	690 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (42)	51 (29)	40 (26)	53 (25)	43 (20)	33 (28)	220 (170)
One or more suspensions	0 (7)	4 (7)	9 (12)	11 (11)	10 (20)	11 (24)	45 (81)
Course failure in ELA or Math	7 (18)	10 (5)	8 (3)	3 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	28 (27)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (36)	34 (44)	33 (52)	80 (132)

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%	52%	-7%	58%	-13%
	2018	45%	48%	-3%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
	2018	38%	41%	-3%	56%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	45%	44%	1%	56%	-11%
	2018	36%	44%	-8%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	55%	-6%	62%	-13%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	55%	-8%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	59%	-8%	64%	-13%
	2018	46%	59%	-13%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	40%	53%	-13%	60%	-20%
	2018	48%	53%	-5%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	42%	49%	-7%	53%	-11%
	2018	37%	48%	-11%	55%	-18%
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 Accel 2017-18
SWD	29	48	59	32	54	53	29				
ELL	36	40		64	70						
BLK	33	63		42	63	50	33				
HSP	43			64							
MUL	35			25							
WHT	53	59	64	50	54	44	49				
FRL	43	56	63	42	53	44	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	27	42	29	28	20	5	31				
ELL	75			83							
BLK	26	41	50	25	27		20				
HSP	63	64		58	36						
MUL	46			46							
WHT	42	42	48	53	40	32	43				
FRL	37	40	47	46	37	33	35				

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	20	48	59	35	45	43	16				
BLK	21	45		34	57	60					
HSP	36	56		50	50		58				
MUL	57			56							
WHT	47	51	49	54	60	43	52				
FRL	39	52	58	51	57	43	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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

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	53
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	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	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	30
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	53
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	50
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.

Subgroup: Multiracial in ELA and Math decreased and did not meet the 32% overall. ELA 46%-35%, Math 46%-25%. This a very small subgroup and in tends to fluctuate so it is hard to track. A teacher was removed the end of 1st 9 weeks and a substitute teacher was placed in the classroom
Math- Proficiency decreased from 50%-48%. A 5th grade teacher was removed the end of 1st 9 weeks and a substitute teacher was placed in the classroom.
In ELA there was a total point gain of 40 and in math only 25. Math is not rising as quickly.

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

The only area with a decline was in Math. Overall proficiency went from 50%-48%. 5th grade had a decrease 48%-40%. A 5th grade teacher was removed the end of 1st 9 weeks and a substitute teacher was placed in the classroom.

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.

5th Grade Math: CES 40% State 60% A teacher was removed the end of 1st 9 weeks and a substitute teacher was placed in the classroom. We were unable to find a teacher to complete the school year.

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

Overall was ELA (increase of 40 pts.), but specifically ELA Learning Gains of the Bottom Quartile (18 pts.) we also had specific subgroups that made significant gains. Students were strategically assigned teachers who were strong in this area and were also provided with strategic interventions and groupings throughout the day to provide supports.
Subgroups:
SWD- 29%-59% in learning gains ELA of BQ and 20%-54% in math learning gains, 5%-53% in math learning gains of the BQ.
Black- Math learning gains increased 27%-63% and science increased 20%-33%

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

Attendance, with a focus on K-2. In grades 3-5 there are still a high level of level 1 students in ELA and Math even though gains are increasing.

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

1. Math proficiency with a focus on 5th grade.
2. Multiracial students in ELA and Math.
3. ELA proficiency.
4. Continuing to increase gains in ELA and Math
5. Attendance for all

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Proficiency
Rationale	In ELA CES students outperformed goals set for learning gains and gains of the lowest quartile. We missed our target for proficiency by 2%, however there was an increase of 6pts. Third grade maintained the same level of proficiency (45%) , while both 4th and 5th increased by 9%. Multiracial students decreased in ELA 46%-35%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Overall proficiency in ELA will increase from 48% - 55%. Learning gains for all will increase 58%- 63% and Learning Gains for the bottom quartile 66%- 70%. Multiracial students will increase from 35%-40% proficient in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michael Homan (michael.homan@levyk12.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue our focus on strategic planning for the core ELA block and interventions with a focus on standards-driven instruction, small groups, and writing to text. To increase overall reading proficiency, our students need to solidify their foundational skills in reading, be presented with higher order thinking questions that will stimulate classroom discourse, improve overall vocabulary, and practice reading as much as possible with rigorous text. Reading coaches work with all grade levels to ensure a common reading block configuration that includes all six areas of reading. This reading block includes small group instruction based on data that is reviewed at least bi-weekly. All schedules in K-5 include at minimum a 40 minute intervention block to ensure an opportunity for each grade level to work with all students on either foundational skills that have gaps or to provide more opportunities to practice with standards to ensure understanding.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Planning standards-based ELA instruction and ensuring that all aspects of the ELA block are taught with fidelity are critical to student success. All strategies discussed are part of the Levy County Reading Plan approved by the State of Florida.

Action Step	
Description	1. Core lead team will meet 1x per week to analyze current ELA data (all grades) to determine areas to discuss w/grade levels. Multi-Racial students is a subgroup that is evaluated every week along with all other subgroups. 2. Teams will meet every other week w/Core lead team to make data based decisions to change instruction as necessary. 3. Reading coaches will meet with teams and individuals to support small group planning and intervention planning. 4. Walkthroughs by administration to ensure all aspects of the reading block are being taught with fidelity
Person Responsible	Michael Homan (michael.homan@levyk12.org)

#2	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	Math proficiency decreased from 50%-48%. Overall math learning gains increased from 39% to 55% after a sharp decrease of 21 pts. the year prior. Learning gains of the bottom quartile increased from 32%-43% after a drop the year prior of 12 pts. Multiracial students dropped from 46%-25% proficiency. Even though gains are increasing proficiency has not. This is a continued area of work.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Overall proficiency in Math will increase from 48%-60%. Learning gains for all will increase from 55%-60% and for bottom quartile 43%-50%. Multiracial students will increase from 25%-32% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michael Homan (michael.homan@levyk12.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will focus on strategic planning for the core Math block and include Math interventions along with interventions in ELA. Teachers will deliver standards-driven instruction and begin to include small group instruction and remediation during math lessons. To increase overall math proficiency, we will support students as they solidify their fluency with basic math facts, are presented with higher order questions that will stimulate classroom discourse, and are presented with opportunities to grapple with rigorous questions that develop problem solving skills. Reading coaches and administration will work with all grade levels to plan lessons that include all of these opportunities. All schedules in K-5 include at minimum a 40 minute intervention block every day. This ensures that students struggling in math and those who need acceleration have at least two days a week for extra math support. Teachers will also participate in math PD to develop their core mathematical knowledge.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Planning standards-based Math instruction and ensuring that all math standards are taught with rigor and fidelity are critical to student success.

Action Step	
Description	1. Core lead team will meet 1x per week to analyze current math data (all grades) to determine areas to discuss w/grade levels. Multi-Racial students is a subgroup that is evaluated every week along with all other subgroups. 2. Teams will meet every other week w/Core lead team to make data based decisions to change instruction as necessary. 3. Reading coaches and administration will meet with teams and individuals to support small group planning and intervention planning. 4. Walkthroughs by administration to ensure math standards are being taught with rigor and fidelity. 5. Teachers will participate in PD to develop their core knowledge of mathematics.
Person Responsible	Michael Homan (michael.homan@levyk12.org)

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, § 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.

Title I Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is attached.
CES continually plans with staff, parents, and community members how to improve school culture and increase family and community involvement. The team created committees for teachers and staff to lead. The goal of the groups are to meet and determine a plan for how to involve other stake holders in their group project. The first group to kick off was the planter improvement group and PTO lead the way. Local businesses, parents, and the High school participated to "re-plant" over 20 beds. Planters continue to be refreshed throughout the year. The motivational messages group has included parents in adding inspiring messages throughout the common areas of the campus. Other groups have met and have also reached out to community members with positive results.

A new area of focus is student celebration and recognition. We are working to find meaningful ways to recognize and celebrate student academic success throughout the school year. We will start the year with a "Night to Shine" where we will recognize students for making growth on FSA and making level 5's.

The PBS team has also worked to revise some activities this year to make events more meaningful for parents. For student of the month parents use to come and watch their child receive a certificate for character trait of the month. This year students will still have a certificate, but the teacher will read a personal message as to what the student did to demonstrate the monthly character trait (this will be on the certificate). The certificate will also include a current picture of the student. Once a nine weeks all of the parents will be invited to this event and we will also serve light morning refreshments.

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.

CES has a two full time school counselors to assist with the social-emotional needs of the students through individual and group counseling with the Sanford Harmony program. Upon receiving a student referral for guidance services from a staff member, our counselor meets with the student and/or parent to assess the current needs of the student. Through the district, CES has a social worker and a District Licensed Psychologist available for additional support. Additionally, the district has support from two Behavioral Specialists and the district also contracts a full-time Counselor and Behavior Specialist through Meridian. Outside referrals may be addressed for extended services such as Meridian Health

(through the use of the Mobile Response Team and Community Action Team), Haven Hospice and MDTP of UF. If needed, the guidance counselor, PST and/or IEP team will meet to develop a behavior plan to implement in the school and home environment. All CES students attend weekly guidance classes during special area time for the development of social/emotional and academic strategies to improve coping skills in both the school and home environment. CES also keeps a clothes closet for those students who may come to school inappropriately dressed for the weather or are in clothes that are dirty and/or ill-fitting. Our School also participates in the Food for Kids Backpack Program which supplies food for students who do not have access to food during weekends and school holidays. CES also refers families that are in need to support homeless families, hygiene needs and expenses with utilities. Assistance is also available for aiding families in filling out paperwork concerning these needs. Family support is also provided through local partnerships with churches and community organizations.

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

Early childhood teachers are involved with professional development opportunities that pertain to them. The administration will develop a plan to allow time for the early childhood teachers to meet with the kindergarten teachers to discuss vertical alignment and expectations. Our school administrators communicate with the local day care centers sharing our school's expectations with their staffs. Learning strategies and activities will be sent to any parent in the community who has a four year old child providing information for the parent to use with their child prior to enrollment in our school for the following school year. Students in our Pre-K program will receive an explicit curriculum called Little Treasures. Pre-K students are evaluated using FLKRS to determine student readiness for Kindergarten. All students are invited to our kindergarten "Round Up" for early screening to determine placement needs for the upcoming school year for kindergarten. Laura Klock, the District Coordinator of Pre-K and Student Services, also provides various professional development throughout the year, and Pre-K teachers receive professional development when they attend Summer Camp provided by Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resource System (FDLRS).

Outgoing cohorts include our 5th grade students transitioning to 6th grade. We support this transition by gradually introducing more independence in student activities. Near the end of the school year, we walk our 5th grade students to the middle school for a tour of the school and a program from the administrator there on middle school expectations. 5th grade students are also invited to attend the Summer Bridge program at the middle 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.

Grade level teams meet two times per month with administration, the Reading Coach and School Counselors. Lead team and ESE team also meet at least monthly sometimes more to analyze data, materials and resources and determine how to meet needs for all students. Core lead team meets weekly to bring all information together to make the best decisions to support needs of students.

Title I, Part A: The school ensures the use of Title I, Part A funds are used for the benefit of all students and subgroups. The school uses the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process throughout the year to determine the needs and budget for the upcoming year.

Title I, Part C Migrant: The Migrant Liaison provides services and support to student and parents. The Liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure student needs are met.

Title II: Professional development for administrators and teachers.

Title III: Services are provided through the district for education materials and (ELL) district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners. Students will use Imagine Literacy and Imagine Math.

Title IV: Services are provided through the district that support a well-rounded education, safe and healthy school conditions and the effective use of technology.

Title X Homeless: The district social worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

IDEA Part B-IDEA funds support school personnel to provide services to students with disabilities and professional development. Additional Professional Development provided to the school but not limited to the following DOE Discretionary Projects are CARD, Regional Local Assistive Technology Specialist, SEDNET and FDLRS.

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

CES follows instructional curriculum in all content areas that are based on College and Career Readiness standards for elementary schools. Therefore building the foundation for students to achieve success.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: ELA Proficiency**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**