Polk County Public Schools

Lake Alfred Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Alfred Elementary School

550 CUMMINGS ST E, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

http://schools.polk-fl.net/lae

Demographics

Principal: Matt Burkett

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2019

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: B (54%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (42%) 2014-15: B (57%)
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

Lake Alfred Elementary School

550 CUMMINGS ST E, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

http://schools.polk-fl.net/lae

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	70%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

The staff at Lake Alfred Elementary believes that all students will reach their full potential and achieve excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:
Lake Alfred Elementary will provide highly effective instruction using best practices to increase student achievement.

Motto: "Learners Achieving Excellence" (LAE)

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
Burkett, Matt	Principal	The leadership team is responsible for every aspect of the student learning that takes place at LAE.
Wilson, Faye	Assistant Principal	
Crowley, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Valdes, Michelle	Instructional Coach	
Smith, Elizabeth	School Counselor	
Hadsock, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	100	106	102	139	112	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	683
Attendance below 90 percent	25	21	15	18	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	2	5	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	4	22	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

34

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 10/9/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	30	15	23	20	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	6	10	11	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	4	14	22	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	16	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	1	3	1	14	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	46%	51%	57%	45%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	51%	58%	46%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	49%	53%	42%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	60%	57%	63%	51%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	56%	62%	47%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	47%	51%	38%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	47%	53%	38%	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	100 (0)	106 (0)	102 (0)	139 (0)	112 (0)	124 (0)	683 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	25 (0)	21 (0)	15 (0)	18 (0)	18 (0)	10 (0)	107 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	4 (0)	5 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	1 (0)	16 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	20 (0)	5 (0)	15 (0)	40 (0)

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	37%	52%	-15%	58%	-21%
	2018	53%	51%	2%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	48%	1%	58%	-9%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	42%	47%	-5%	56%	-14%
	2018	56%	50%	6%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	56%	0%	64%	-8%
	2018	69%	57%	12%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	59%	51%	8%	60%	-1%
	2018	52%	56%	-4%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
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	18	25	18	29	31						

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	36	45	22	56	69	65	26				
BLK	37	42	50	54	62	58	50				
HSP	43	46	28	58	66	60	35				
WHT	61	69	62	69	63		71				
FRL	39	50	50	53	60	55	44				

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	38	22	21	39	48	46					
ELL	52	57	44	55	48	43	61				
BLK	38	45	41	41	45	26	52				
HSP	65	62	47	63	38	40	71				
WHT	62	54	70	70	62	50	69				
FRL	52	54	56	54	45	34	63				

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	10	34	32	19	34	29	10				
ELL	27	36	26	44	50	37	17				
BLK	34	44	36	44	44	36	23				
HSP	44	47	43	50	51	33	37				
WHT	58	43		59	43	50	59				
FRL	38	44	44	46	46	39	22				

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	56
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	48
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	53
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	50
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	66
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	52
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.

Third grade reading proficiency was 39%. We replaced two teachers with two new teachers.

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

Third grade ELA proficiency.

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.

Our 3rd grade reading proficiency had the largest gap.

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

Greatest improvement was bottom 25% learning gains in math

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

Student referral and attendance are areas of concern.

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

1. 3rd grade reading proficiency
2. SWD reading proficiency
3. Reduce school discipline referrals.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:	

#1	
Title	3rd grade reading proficiency
Rationale	Our 3rd grade proficiency was 39%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	3rd grade reading proficiency will increase from 39% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matt Burkett (matt.burkett@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Reading Interventionist 2. A grade level para will work specifically with third grade students. 3. The team will be departmentalized. 4. After school, and Saturday tutoring for 3rd grade.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The reason the Reading Interventionist and Title 1 paraprofessional are being utilized to help increase our reading proficiency by 11%.

Action Step	
Description	Title 1 positions responsible for ensuring the implementation: Literacy Coach, Math Coach, Reading Interventionist, & two paraprofessionals. 1. Each grade level 3rd-5th has designated highly effective teachers to provide instruction in reading as part of departmentalization. 2. Provide extra time for explicit instruction to help close learning gaps. 3. Implementation of Nearpod Computer Program. 4. Small group instruction using Lakeshore resources, Ipads, Florida Ready, and Classroom Library Books 5. Four days a week after-school tutoring and monthly Saturday Academy 6. Reading proficiency will be enhanced by utilitizing Reading Wonder Tests, which requires printing. Florida Ready and Library books are used in small groups instruction. 7. The LSI Standards Tracker is used to monitor students' progress, which allows teachers to meet the individual needs of students. 8. The LSI summer PD allowed teachers gain skills and strategies to implement research based instruction. 9. Extended learning (special Activity) will use Florida ready curriculum. 10. Extra time for collaborative planning (special activity). 11. Reading Interventionist will provide explicit individual instruction in small groups to our bottom 25% students
Person Responsible	Matt Burkett (matt.burkett@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Reading proficiency for our students with disabilities (SWD).
Rationale	SWD proficiency was 36%
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	SWD proficiency will increase from 36% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matt Burkett (matt.burkett@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. The reading coach will be working with the Inclusion, Separated Classroom, and Regular Ed teachers. 2. Paraprofessionals are assigned to the specific grade levels and Separated Classroom. 3. MTSS will be closely monitored in monthly meetings and as needed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The reason the Reading Interventionist and Title 1 paraprofessionale are being utilized to help increase our reading proficiency by 5%.
Action Step	
Description	Title 1 positions responsible for ensuring the implementation: Literacy Coach, Math Coach, Reading Interventionist, & two paraprofessionals. 1. Each grade level 3rd-5th has designated highly effective teachers to provide instruction in reading as part of departmentalization. 2. Provide extra time for explicit instruction to help close learning gaps. 3. Implementation of Nearpod Computer Program. 4. Small group instruction using Lakeshore resources, Ipads, Florida Ready, and Classroom Library Books 5. Four days a week after-school tutoring and monthly Saturday Academy 6. Two additional staff members have been added to the Separate Classroom to help support reading instruction . Reading proficiency will be enhanced by utilitizing Reading Wonder Tests, which requires printing. Florida Ready and Library books are used in small groups instruction. 7. The LSI Standards Tracker is used to monitor students' progress, which allows teachers to meet the individual needs of students. 8. The LSI summer PD allowed teachers gain skills and strategies to implement research based instruction. 9. Students will experience real world reading through off campus field trips such as Kennedy Space Center, Wonder Works, and MOSI
Person Responsible	Matt Burkett (matt.burkett@polk-fl.net)

#3	
Title	Reduce Office referrals
Rationale	We had 418 office referrals.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will reduce the number of office referrals by 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matt Burkett (matt.burkett@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	School-wide Behavior Management (PBiS)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	PBIS is a research based proven strategy to improve classroom and school environments.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide school-wide PD to teachers on effective classroom management. 2. Target the teachers who had the highest number of referrals for individual PD 3. Implement Stanford Harmony social skills curriculum. (Specials's teachers will implement) 4. Utilize Envo for severe student needs
Person Responsible	Faye Wilson (faye.wilson@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).

LSI strategies will continue to be implemented in all subjects with a focus on student autonomy.

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.

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.
50% of our student's parents will participate in parent activities hosted by our school.
90% of our parents will have updated information in our Parent Portal program to receive E-Connect notifications.

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.

Students identified as having social-emotional needs are given the opportunity to meet with the guidance counselor individually or in small groups or if applicable can be met through the classroom staff on a one-to-one basis. Severe cases may be handled with a contracted mental health counselor. The IEP also identifies and addresses social emotional goals for all of our students. Our school also utilizes the following resources (not all will apply and please elaborate on applicable resources):
• Champs
• PBIS
• Mindful Schools
• Mentoring Programs

Social-emotional needs of students are met through a support system that is designed to provide conflict-resolution techniques and good decision making practices, purposed to equip the students with skills necessary to maintain acceptable behavior that is conducive to being a productive citizen and successful student. An outside agency (ENVO) will provide specific behavioral supports to our students in need. Our school also uses PBIS. We have a mentoring program and we use the Stanford Harmony social skills curriculum.

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

Each year the school hosts Kindergarten round up where Pre–K students and parents come and visit the classrooms, meet the teachers, and participate in a brief screening so parents can see what areas they will need to review prior to entrance into Kindergarten. Our feeder schools present their programs to our 5th graders in an assembly.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

• Title I, Part A 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 I, Part C project funds assist students that are prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status, as defined by federal and state regulations.
• Title I, Part D project funds provide Transition Facilitators at select Neglected and Delinquent school sites to assist students who transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school.
• 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. Also, may reimburse certification exam fees for teachers placed in an area in which they do not yet have certification in upon successful passing of exam.
• 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.
Use of Funds:
Before and after school tutoring
To pay salaries for paraprofessionals,Reading Interventionist and Reading/Math Coaches salary
Supplemental instructional support and materials
Tutors
professional development
Additional Para used for tutoring
Software as needed
Materials and equipment
Library materials
Agendas

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

Each year two students are selected for a local scholarship program. Higher level students will be challenged with above grade level materials. Guest speakers will share their jobs with the kids.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: 3rd grade reading proficiency				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	650-Motor Vehicles (including buses)	0651 - Lake Alfred Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$0.00
			0651 - Lake Alfred Elementary School			$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading proficiency for our students with disabilities (SWD).				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reduce Office referrals				$0.00
					Total:	$0.00