

Polk County Public Schools

R. Bruce Wagner Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

R. Bruce Wagner Elementary School

5500 YATES RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/rbw>

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Miller

Start Date for this Principal: 8/16/2019

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 (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

R. Bruce Wagner Elementary School

5500 YATES RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/rbw>

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	97%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

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 Polk 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.

We will ensure learning takes place for all through high expectations, family involvement, and instruction rich in communication & technology.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students, families, and staff work hand in hand to develop responsible, respectful, reliable, lifelong learners . . . every child, every family, every day...Learning for All; Whatever it Takes!

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
Miller , Christopher	Principal	
Allen, Marieka	Instructional Coach	
Guptill, Erin	Instructional Coach	
Weeks, Sudi	Instructional Coach	
Upton, Tracie	Assistant Principal	
Camp, Shelley	Dean	
Sherman, Timothy	Other	Math Interventionist

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	131	118	122	155	135	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	800
Attendance below 90 percent	7	23	23	23	23	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	3	8	7	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA or Math	15	32	20	48	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	3	7	15	21	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

40

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/16/2019

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	0	26	26	32	16	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	13	8	11	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	24	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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	4	8	5	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	0	26	26	32	16	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	13	8	11	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	24	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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	4	8	5	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	50%	51%	57%	49%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	51%	58%	53%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	49%	53%	49%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	60%	57%	63%	49%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	56%	62%	53%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	47%	51%	51%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	47%	53%	56%	46%	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	131 (0)	118 (0)	122 (0)	155 (0)	135 (0)	139 (0)	800 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 (0)	23 (26)	23 (26)	23 (32)	23 (16)	17 (35)	116 (135)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	3 (1)	8 (4)	7 (2)	7 (3)	8 (3)	33 (13)
Course failure in ELA or Math	15 (0)	32 (13)	20 (8)	48 (11)	17 (4)	21 (13)	153 (49)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	23 (26)	7 (24)	15 (41)	45 (91)

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	52%	52%	0%	58%	-6%
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	48%	-9%	58%	-19%
	2018	44%	48%	-4%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	47%	47%	0%	56%	-9%
	2018	61%	50%	11%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%
	2018	47%	56%	-9%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	56%	-12%	64%	-20%
	2018	62%	57%	5%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	62%	51%	11%	60%	2%
	2018	49%	56%	-7%	61%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	45%	4%	53%	-4%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	55%	-4%
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	21	30	32	40	49	39	29				
ELL	22	34	30	44	51	63	18				
BLK	35	39	31	40	55	43	46				
HSP	43	45	30	55	55	46	35				
WHT	60	50	50	69	63	50	63				
FRL	40	46	38	54	55	42	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	21	37	36	23	34						
ELL	21	41	37	41	63	53					
BLK	39	48	38	37	40	20	50				
HSP	43	51	48	53	62	52	58				
WHT	57	52	48	62	64	35	55				
FRL	43	48	48	49	55	40	43				

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	13	39	36	29	39	35	14				
ELL	28	38	53	28	51	69	41				
BLK	29	29	25	31	50	27	17				
HSP	38	51	60	38	57	62	53				
MUL	40	54		33	31						
WHT	60	59	48	62	53	50	68				
FRL	39	50	51	38	44	48	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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	41
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	46
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	58
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	46
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 data component that showed the lowest performance is 4th grade ELA and mathematics, proficiency, learning gains and lowest 25% learning gains. Our class sizes were in excess of 25+ students. We also lost support of our school-based math coach in January. The proficiency of 4th grade students had low proficiency in 3rd grade. The school discipline referral rate was highest in 4th grade.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was 5th grade ELA and 4th grade mathematics proficiency. An ineffective math teacher and loss of our math coach contributed to 4th grade's decrease in proficiency. An ineffective ELA teacher in 5th grade and overall decrease in writing proficiency. There was also a staffing change in 5th grade ELA.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 4th grade mathematics proficiency and 4th grade ELA proficiency..

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

3rd grade mathematics showed the most improvement due to first year departmentalization and intentional small groups.

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

Attendance is a potential area of concern for our school due to trend data of EWS.

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

1. Small Group Instruction with FOCUS on SWD and ELL Students
2. Focus on Lowest 25 % Learning Gains ELA and Mathematics
3. Increase percentage of student attendance
4. Decrease discipline data
5. Increase STEM model classrooms in each grade level

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Small Group Instruction for ELL students
Rationale	The ESSA Data indicated that this subgroup performed lower than 41%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELL students will perform at 45% proficient on FSA in ELA and Mathematics. We will monitor progress through STAR three times per year, and compare formative assessments in monthly PLCs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Administration and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs targeting whole group and small group instruction to determine trends across grade levels and school-wide. During collaborative planning, teachers will work to tier student tasks to target student needs based on data (whole group and small group). Administration and teachers will monitor student progress towards mastery of standards on a weekly basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Learning Sciences International (LSI) is a research based collection of strategies that positively impact student achievement. We will monitor for evidence with Trend Tracker with 5 classrooms, 5 days a week.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Learning Engaging Productive Teams at the beginning of the year during pre-planning 2. C4i- Coaching for implementation support walks with LSI coach and leadership team. 3. Administration and Leadership Team structures walks during small group instruction times. 4. Professional Learning Building Team Ownership at mid-year 5. Increase capacity with Leadership Academy with staff 6. LSI-monitoring tools for learning 7. Formative Assessments 8. Tiered Small Group Instruction 9. SIPPS- phonics based instruction 10. STEM materials- for enhancing instruction in Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics 11. The school based ELA and Math will assist in providing coaching in small groups and reviewing data with teachers to make instructional decisions. 12. GradeCam has been purchased to assist in providing immediate student feedback to teachers in order to help make instruction decisions in a timely manner. Teachers and staff will work with administration to review data and make instructional decisions.
Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Small Group Instruction for SWD students
Rationale	The ESSA Data indicated that this subgroup performed lower than 34%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	SWD students will perform at 41% proficient on FSA in ELA and Mathematics. We will monitor progress through STAR three times per year, and compare formative assessments in monthly PLCs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Administration and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs targeting whole group and small group instruction to determine trends across grade levels and school-wide. During collaborative planning, teachers will work to tier student tasks to target student needs based on data (whole group and small group). Administration and teachers will monitor student progress towards mastery of standards on a weekly basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Learning Sciences International (LSI) is a research-based collection of strategies that positively impact student achievement. We will monitor for evidence with Trend Tracker with 5 classrooms, 5 days a week.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Learning Engaging Productive Teams at the beginning of the year during pre-planning 2. C4i- Coaching for implementation support walks with LSI coach and leadership team. 3. Administration and Leadership Team structures walks during small group instruction times. 4. Professional Learning Building Team Ownership at mid-year 5. Increase capacity with Leadership Academy with staff 6. The school based ELA and Math will assist in providing coaching in small groups and reviewing data with teachers to make instructional decisions. 7. GradeCam has been purchased to assist in providing immediate student feedback to teachers in order to help make instruction decisions in a timely manner. Teachers and staff will work with administration to review data and make instructional decisions.
Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

#3	
Title	Lowest 25%
Rationale	The bottom 25% was consistently one of the lowest performing components in our school grade.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the learning gains of the lowest 25% will increase by 10% in all subjects.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Administration and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs targeting whole group and small group instruction to determine trends across grade levels and school-wide. During collaborative planning, teachers will work to tier student tasks to target student needs based on data (whole group and small group). Administration and teachers will monitor student progress towards mastery of standards on a weekly basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Tiered direct instruction in targeted groups will increase students' performance and potentially increase proficiency. Learning Sciences International (LSI) is a research-based collection of strategies that positively impact student achievement. We will monitor for evidence with Trend Tracker with 5 classrooms, 5 days a week.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Learning Engaging Productive Teams at the beginning of the year during pre-planning 2. C4i- Coaching for implementation support walks with LSI coach and leadership team. 3. Administration and Leadership Team structures walks during small group instruction times. 4. Professional Learning Building Team Ownership at mid-year 5. Increase capacity with Leadership Academy with staff 6. Hire a mathematics interventionist to target lowest 25% students 7. LSI-monitoring tools for learning 8. SIPPS-direct instruction phonics program 9. Push-in Para Support 10. Targeted Extended Learning Program-after school tutoring 11. Formative Assessments 12. Tiered Small Group Instruction 13. Scheduled students in classrooms for inclusion model best practice 14. STEM materials to enhance instruction in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics. Teachers who teach STEM were provided additional planning days in July. During this time, teachers were able to work with our district based science coach and curriculum science k-5 specialist. 15. The school based ELA and Math will assist in pulling small groups, providing coaching in small groups, and reviewing data with teachers to make instructional decisions. 16. Each teacher will be provided two full days (1 day first semester/1 day second semester) of planning in order to review data and plan small group instruction. 17. Teachers will be required to bring their Reading Wonders Assessments to planning

each week to review data and make instructional decisions for small groups based upon the data.

18. GradeCam has been purchased to assist in providing immediate student feedback to teachers in order to help make instruction decisions in a timely manner. Teachers and staff will work with administration to review data and make instructional decisions.

Person Responsible Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

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 increase STEM model classrooms in each grade level, project-based learning materials for Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics will be purchased to enhance the STEM classroom experience.

Teachers will be given collaborative planning days to address targeted small group instruction with emphasis on lowest 25%, ELL, SWD, and enrichment (STEM).

In order to encourage student attendance, positive behavior and academic growth, students will be provided an opportunity to attend a mid-year celebration by going to the movie theater.

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.

Please see attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

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.

Skillstreaming lessons are utilized by teachers when a class need or small group need is identified within the class or grade level. The guidance counselor supports the affective needs of students through whole class guidance lessons each year, small group meetings, and some individual counseling support. A mentoring program is in place that matches adults (parents or community members) with individual students or small groups of students for support that is focused more on social-emotional rather than academic help. The school personnel works in tandem with itinerant personnel (social worker, mental health counselor, psychologist) to share pertinent information related to student emotional health. Monthly grade level MTSS meetings address academic and behavioral interventions for each teacher's class.

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

Beginning with Kindergarten Round Up in the spring, incoming kindergarten students are screened for basic identification of letters, numbers, shapes, and knowledge. The screening information is provided to the classroom teacher to assist in initial planning for instruction. Kindergarten teachers will utilize other screening tools within the first weeks of the school year to individually assess students knowledge of multiple pre-reading related skills and knowledge. STAR will be utilized three times a year to monitor students' growth towards grade level expectations.

For students exiting our school for the middle school setting, collaboration with 6th grade teachers occurs in the Spring when our outgoing 5th graders visit their feeder middle school and the middle school teachers visit our campus to meet with, and do learning activities with the students. 5th graders also have an opportunity to visit the We3Expo.

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 once a week to formally to ensure the alignment of personnel, material resources, and teacher & student needs for support. Following each series of progress monitoring data collection, Leadership Team members assist teachers with data dis aggregation. Monthly meetings related to MTSS are also held with the Leadership Team members each being matched with a teacher from the grade level, in order to ensure proper focus is given to coordinating support. All funding received through federal, state, or local funds will be utilized as stipulated from the originating agency or organization in order to support student learning, address academic deficits, meet basic student needs, parent involvement programs and initiatives, and providing for support personnel or materials that will support student learning with ELL, & ESE. We will use Title I funds to support learning. •Title I, Part A project funds school-wide services at our eligible and participating Title I schools. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions so that all students achieve academic success.

Title II funds provide professional development resources to build the capacity of teachers by funding consultants, district professional development personnel, including district/regional coaches, and curriculum specialists. The Title II project contributes to the recruitment/retention of teachers in the district by funding district recruitment personnel, recruitment initiatives both within and outside the school district.

Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, professional learning opportunities for school staff, as well as parent family engagement opportunities.

Title IX – Homeless OR HEARTH Program funded through Title IX and Title I, provides support for students identified as being in a homeless situation. Title I provides support for this program, through funding of HEARTH staff, professional development, and contracted extended learning services for students.

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: Small Group Instruction for ELL students	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Small Group Instruction for SWD students	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lowest 25%	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00