John D. Floyd Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

John D. Floyd Elementary School

3139 DUMONT AVE, Spring Hill, FL 34609

https://www.hernandoschools.org/fes

Demographics

Principal: Joyce Lewis

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2016

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 (53%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hernando 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

John D. Floyd Elementary School

3139 DUMONT AVE, Spring Hill, FL 34609

https://www.hernandoschools.org/fes

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	No	95%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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 mission of John D. Floyd Elementary School is to promote a partnership with students, parents, and the community by providing a supportive educational environment enhanced by technology that encourages problem solving and responsible choices, thus preparing all to meet tomorrow's challenges.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Attitude Determines Altitude...

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
White, Elissa	Teacher, K-12	Attend the SBLT and represent 2nd grade. Bring data and be able to discuss it.
Anderson, Kara	Teacher, K-12	Attend SBLT for 1st grade.. Be able to discuss grade level data and students.
Lewis, Joyce	Principal	Facilitate meetings.
Tomlinson, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Discuss discipline data.
Rode, Wendi	Teacher, K-12	Attend SBLT for 1st grade.. Be able to discuss grade level data and students.
Oppedal, Jan	Teacher, K-12	Discuss school wide data.
Jackson, Sid	School Counselor	Discuss parent concerns and incident reports.

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	141	151	161	172	160	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	914
Attendance below 90 percent	56	46	60	50	48	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	303
One or more suspensions	12	10	18	18	24	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	1	2	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	40	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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	4	6	18	23	22	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	1	2	28	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
69

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	28	22	7	10	13	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	12	7	22	13	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	3	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	46	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	9	7	22	20	25	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

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	28	22	7	10	13	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	12	7	22	13	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	3	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	46	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	9	7	22	20	25	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

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	57%	54%	57%	53%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	53%	58%	43%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	52%	53%	42%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	58%	63%	51%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	52%	57%	62%	29%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	48%	51%	19%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	54%	53%	50%	54%	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	141 (0)	151 (0)	161 (0)	172 (0)	160 (0)	129 (0)	914 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	56 (28)	46 (22)	60 (7)	50 (10)	48 (13)	43 (28)	303 (108)
One or more suspensions	12 (12)	10 (7)	18 (22)	18 (13)	24 (19)	20 (16)	102 (89)
Course failure in ELA or Math	13 (12)	1 (3)	2 (4)	4 (13)	3 (0)	5 (0)	28 (32)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	34 (30)	40 (46)	36 (50)	110 (126)

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	56%	57%	-1%	58%	-2%
	2018	56%	62%	-6%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	59%	-5%	58%	-4%
	2018	60%	53%	7%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	54%	52%	2%	56%	-2%
	2018	47%	53%	-6%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	62%	-2%	62%	-2%
	2018	67%	67%	0%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	62%	-12%	64%	-14%
	2018	52%	60%	-8%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	55%	-5%	53%	-3%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	22	54	60	25	43	45	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
ELL	65	80		55	40						
BLK	56	62		39	65						
HSP	58	62	75	52	48	56	43				
MUL	57	50		43	50						
WHT	57	52	49	59	52	40	54				
FRL	49	50	49	49	46	45	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	23	55	58	33	30	43					
ELL	28	44		39	44						
BLK	48	60		42	40		50				
HSP	56	62	57	56	54	48	56				
MUL	59	53		52	45		64				
WHT	54	48	50	56	46	36	44				
FRL	51	49	44	52	43	34	45				

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	21	41	42	18	14	10	23				
ELL	29	36		29	25						
BLK	59	52		53	33		50				
HSP	44	41	41	38	26	28	44				
MUL	57	27		54	31						
WHT	55	44	43	55	29	13	53				
FRL	48	40	42	48	29	23	41				

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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	60
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	56
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	56
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	50
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	52
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The subgroup with the lowest performance is our SWD. In 2018 23% of the students in ELA were proficient and in 2019 22% of the students were proficient. In math, 33% of the students were proficient in 2018 and 25% were proficient in 2019. Only having one resource room for students in K-5 is a contributing factor for our low SWD scores. Another factor is the lack of training to our Gen Ed teachers in different methodologies to help SWD. Our SWD have traditionally scored much lower than Gen Ed students.

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

Our biggest decline from the 2018 school year is in math. When compared to 2018 3rd grade dropped 2% to 60%, 4th grade dropped 12% to 50% and 5th grade dropped 2% to 52%.

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

When comparing JD Floyd to the state average, the largest gap was in Math Learning Gains. In 2019 the state 62% of the students in the state were proficent as compared to 52% at JD Floyd. While we are still 10% below the state average, we been steadily making improvements going up 5% in 2018.

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

The component that showed the most improvement are our ELL Students. In ELA our students went from 28% proficient in 2018 to 65% proficient. In math, our students went from 39% proficient in 2018 to 55% in 2019.

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 concerns using the EWS data is the number of students who were absent more than 10% of the school year. Currently 108 students are below 90% absences. Another area of concern as noted on the EWS is the number of students who scored a Level 1 on the state assessment at 126.

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

1. SWD student scoring 3 or higher on the ELA and Math FSA (22%)
2. 4th grade achievement level on the math FSA (50%)
3. Students who are absent 10 or more percent of the year. (108)
4. Math learning gains for all students. (52%)
5. Bottom quartile students showing learning gains in math. (46%)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Our focus will be increasing math learning gains for all students by 3% for students in grades 3-5.
Rationale	Based on district and state data, JD Floyd shows the greatest deficit in students making learning gains in math. JD Floyd only has 52% of our students making adequate progress, where the state was at 62% and the district was at 57%. While we improved 5% points on the 2019 FSA test, we are still below state and district level.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	JD Floyd 3-5 grade students will increase learning gains in math by 3% which will help close the gap between district and state averages.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Kick Start 2. After School Tutoring 3. iReady Math Custom courses.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	1. By providing after school tutoring early in the year, it will enable us to close some of the gaps early in the year so they can be successful in the current year. 2. Cusp students will be the focus of the After School Tutoring to give them extra help in the components based on FSA and iReady. 3. Using the iReady Diagnostic students will create custom course to ensure the students specific weakness are being addressed.
Action Step	
Description	1. Share disaggregated math data with teachers and build small groups based on iReady data (Lewis and Tomlinson) 2. Monitor iReady data to ensure students are receiving the necessary time as outlined by iReady protocol. 3. Meet monthly with math teachers to review classroom data (benchmarks, formatives) and iReady data. 4. Meet quarterly for data chats with a focus on the bottom quartile and how they are performing in MTSS. 5. Provide paras to assist with Tier II remediation allowing teachers to pull more Tier III groups. This will be monitored through MTSS logs documenting the standards addressed.
Person Responsible	Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	If staff focuses on rigourous standards based instruction, the student achievement will improve. We will increase proficiency or 3 or higher by 2% in ELA and Math.
Rationale	If teachers increase rigorous standards based instruction, the gap between JD Floyd and the district and state will decrease.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	JD Floyd's achievement level will go up 2% in ELA from a 57% to a 59%. Our Math achievement level in Math will increase 2% from 55% to 57%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joyce Lewis (lewis_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Lesson planning checks 2. Lesson planning PD with our district reading coach 3. Administration walkthrough
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	1. Administration will check teachers lesson plans to ensure students are planning effective lessons to reach all students. 2. Our district reading coach will meet regularly with teams to assist teachers with planning effective lessons. 3. Administration will conduct regular walkthroughs with the teachers lesson plans to ensure the lesson being taught matches the lessons written.
Action Step	
Description	1. District coaches will come in during team planning to assist teachers. 2. Lesson plans will be turned in by Monday and evaluated by administrators. 3. Teachers will be required to use iReady lesson plans during whole and small group instruction. 4. Walkthroughs will occur daily to ensure lessons being taught match lesson plans and standards. 5. Data chats will occur monthly to ensure teachers are aware of where their students are and can adjust instruction.
Person Responsible	Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	If staff use effective learning strategies for students with disabilities, student achievement in ELA and Math will improve.
Rationale	SWD are the lowest achieving subgroup in our school. For the 2019 school year, only 22% scored a 3 or higher on the ELA FSA and only 25% of our students score a 3 or higher on the Math FSA.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	SWD will increase their achievement level by 2% in ELA from a 22% to a 24%. SWD will increase their achievement level by 2% in math from a 25% to a 27%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joyce Lewis (lewis_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	-Small groups using a reading resource teacher in grades 3-5 focusing on weakness based on a students FSA score and iReady data. -iReady custom course set up for each student based on their need. -Differentiated small group instruction using iReady, SRA and FCCR materials
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies were chosen because students with disabilities need small group, very deliberate instruction in order to close the achievement gap. By focusing on the students area of weakness, those gaps can be closed more effectively.
Action Step	
Description	1. Data from SWD will be monitored closely in ensure growth is occurring. (iReady, classroom data) 2. SWD will receive small group instruction from Paras focused on their areas of weakness. 3. Lesson plans will be monitored to ensure small group instruction is planned and delivered in class. .
Person Responsible	Melissa Tomlinson (tomlinson_m@hcsb.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).

In order to address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities, administration will conduct regular walkthroughs and discuss areas of weakness with each specific teacher. Lesson plans will be monitored regularly. We will also be meeting monthly with teams to discuss data and student concerns especially the students with disabilities.

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.

At the beginning of every school year, we host an Open House where parents are invited to meet the teachers, visit classrooms and tour the campus. During this event representatives from PTA,SAC,STEAM and Boys and Girls club are among the many organizations available to talk with families. Our Volunteer Coordinator is also available to facilitate the volunteer process with parents and family members. Parents are kept informed of their child's progress on a daily basis via agenda's and weekly Chalk updates. Important information about school activities is also posted regularly on our Facebook page and included in the global phone message to all parents. PTA hosts many activities to support JD Floyd including skate nights, Holiday House, dances, social events, and Movie nights. Administration also hosts Pastry for Parents, Family math, ELA and science nights, chorus concerts and kindergarten shows.

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.

Our school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met through the use of multi-tiered system of support (MTSS). MTSS is a multi-tiered support program that uses a problem solving approach. It provides additional academic/behavior support for teachers, administration, certified school guidance counselors, behavior specialist, social workers and school psychologist to students in need. There are three tiers: Tier 1 focuses on a more universal or classroom approach. Tier 2 provides additional small group support and Tier 3 is more intensive and provides more individual support. Students who need additional behavioral/emotional support will be included in skill building intervention strategies, as needed, along with classroom based interventions. JD Floyd also utilizes the Zones of Regulations in order to teach students how to self-monitor their emotions and feelings.

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

John D. Floyd Elementary School hosts a Kindergarten Round Up in May for students who are zoned for the elementary school. Incoming Kindergarten students and their families are invited to meet the teachers, tour the classrooms, media center, cafeteria, playground, and take a ride on a school bus. Kindergarten expectations of skills are provided. The Kindergarten Team provides materials, strategies and suggestions on how parents can work with their incoming Kindergarten student at home in order to help support their academic success. In August, a separate Kindergarten Open House occurs the week prior to school starting to allow students to meet the teacher they are assigned to and see their classroom. Students in grade 5 will visit their zoned schools or representatives from those schools will come speak to the students about transitioning to 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.

All available resources are aligned with needs based on input from teachers, parents, school-based leadership and school-wide data. Professional Development is determined by district initiatives and school based needs assessment. District support is also provided through Title I funded personnel, programs and materials, Title II funded Professional Development. Title III support for our ESOL students, Title IX (formerly Title X) support for our McKinney-Vento Students and Families in Transition Liaison and Advocate and IDEA support for our students with disabilities. Needs are also assessed on a daily basis depending on walk-through observations and subsequent reflection. Teachers are provided opportunities to schedule visits to other classrooms and neighboring schools to observe best practices. To increase opportunities for additional tiered support based on student performance the master schedule was redesigned to increase student support and maximize key personnel during DIVE (Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction). The master schedule was re-organized to allow for grades k-5 to provide enrichment and tiered support across the campus at a specific time, by grade level to increase availability of personnel while providing Tiered support.

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

Hernando County offers a College and Career Expo at Pasco Hernando State College where families can learn about the different unique career academies available at each of our high schools as well as vocational, technical, and ROTC programs available through our high schools and PHSC. Additionally, The Parent Academy hosts a STEAM (Science Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math) night each October at Nature Coast Technical High School where community organizations, government agencies (Forestry, for example) and schools host interactive stations for students to explore activities related to these career fields. Students in 3rd-5th grade have the opportunity to attend our after-school STEAM program that integrates higher order thinking activities into their learning.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Our focus will be increasing math learning gains for all students by 3% for students in grades 3-5.**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: If staff focuses on rigourous standards based instruction, the student achievement will improve. We will increase proficiency or 3 or higher by 2% in ELA and Math.**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: If staff use effective learning strategies for students with disabilities, student achievement in ELA and Math will improve.**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**