R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School

10200 ASHTON BROSNAHAM RD, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Kristen Danley H

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School

10200 ASHTON BROSNAHAM RD, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	70%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of R.C. Lipscomb Elementary is to encourage students to make the most of their potential; to become independent thinkers and lifelong learners; and to produce self-reliant, productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We envision a school where children are placed first. Our school is a loving and nurturing environment which emphasizes student performance and rewards it. It is a safe and orderly environment with guidelines and procedures that bring out the best in each child. R.C. Lipscomb Elementary is a place where parents, grandparents, and volunteers from all aspects of the community work toward one common goal of helping children achieve.

Our vision is one where learning is fostered through innovative and engaging techniques and ideas. R.C. Lipscomb Elementary is a place where developmentally appropriate activities are offered to students in such a manner as to foster the best academically in each child. It is a place where music, art, and P.E. are integrated with other forms of art and culture to enhance learning. It is a value rich environment where core values are lived and demonstrated by example. It is a place where administrators, teachers, and parents set standards and help students live up to those standards. It is a place where technology is integrated into the total curriculum. Finally, R.C. Lipscomb Elementary is a place that leads the way in every aspect of the educational program.

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
Quarells, Barbara	Assistant Principal	Facilitates the operation of all school programs, procedures, and safety protocol.
Sanders, Susan	Principal	Facilitates the operation of all school programs, procedures, and safety protocol.
Collier, Kim	Teacher, K-12	Serves as grade level chair person for first grade. She attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. She facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.
Choat, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Serves as grade level chair person for second grade. She attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. She facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.
Celis, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Serves as grade level chair person for third grade. She attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. She facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.
Druhl, Rachel	Teacher, ESE	Serves as grade level chair person for the ESE Team. She attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. She facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.
Golloher, Kristina	Teacher, K-12	Serves as grade level chair person for fifth grade. She attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. She facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.
Presley, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	Serves as grade level chair person for kindergarten. She attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. She facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.
Skelton, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Serves as grade level chair person for fourth grade. She attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. She facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.
Passmore, Neil	Teacher, K-12	Serves as grade level chair person for the special area team. He attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. He facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.

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	118	128	120	151	139	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	797
Attendance below 90 percent	11	21	12	20	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	2	5	0	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	9	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	2	7	1	4	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
50

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 8/21/2019

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	3	5	5	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	9	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	4	8	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	10	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	3	5	5	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	9	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	4	8	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	10	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	71%	53%	57%	70%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	55%	58%	57%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	52%	53%	51%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	71%	57%	63%	75%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	60%	62%	70%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	52%	51%	66%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	54%	53%	61%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	118 (0)	128 (0)	120 (0)	151 (0)	139 (0)	141 (0)	797 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	11 (3)	21 (5)	12 (5)	20 (7)	17 (5)	21 (1)	102 (26)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	5 (1)	0 (5)	4 (9)	5 (4)	7 (3)	23 (22)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	9 (6)	5 (4)	2 (8)	1 (6)	0 (4)	17 (28)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (6)	22 (20)	27 (23)	50 (49)

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	77%	56%	21%	58%	19%
	2018	67%	52%	15%	57%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	52%	16%	58%	10%
	2018	66%	51%	15%	56%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	64%	51%	13%	56%	8%
	2018	65%	44%	21%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	71%	55%	16%	62%	9%
	2018	69%	54%	15%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	58%	13%	64%	7%
	2018	76%	58%	18%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	65%	55%	10%	60%	5%
	2018	71%	52%	19%	61%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	71%	55%	16%	53%	18%
	2018	67%	55%	12%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	43	56	46	46	57	34	53				
ASN	100	90		92	90						
BLK	41	45	41	45	53	43	52				
HSP	59	55		82	64						
MUL	69	62		58	60		67				
WHT	78	62	57	77	66	33	77				
FRL	60	58	55	59	59	42	57				

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	40	45	35	51	55	41	56				
ASN	79			86							
BLK	43	55	48	49	62	50	33				
HSP	64			93							
MUL	62	69		54	75						
WHT	75	55	26	80	63	58	77				
FRL	60	52	43	67	65	55	58				

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	45	40	39	42	44	36	24				
ASN	80			80							
BLK	46	50	45	48	61	60	38				
HSP	67			75							
MUL	61	43		59	36		45				
WHT	77	59	54	82	73	78	68				
FRL	60	53	47	69	69	62	51				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	93
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
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	65
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	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	64
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	56
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.

Math lowest 25th percentile was the lowest performing area for our school. We scored 41% in this area, compared to 55% from the previous year. Teachers focused more heavily on the ELA lowest quartile students and spent additional instructional time on reading interventions within small group instruction.

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

Math lowest 25th percentile showed the greatest decline from the previous year. We scored 41% in this area, compared to 55% from the previous year. Teachers focused more heavily on the ELA lowest quartile students and spent additional instructional time on reading interventions within small group instruction.

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.

We scored higher than the state, in every school grade component, with the exception of math lowest 25% percentile. We were 10% lower than the state in math lowest 25th percentile. Teachers focused more heavily on the ELA lowest quartile students and spent additional instructional time on reading interventions within small group instruction.

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile showed the most improvement. We scored 55% as compared to 38% the previous year. We tracked the students from the beginning of the year, in the lowest quartile, using quarterly STAR assessment data. The school-wide data team met to manage and discuss the data. Data team members met with each grade level and developed a plan, for individual students, based on the data. We implemented many standards based resources and instruction to reach this population.

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

The number of students scoring a level 1 on statewide assessments is an area of concern.

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

1. Math Lowest 25th Percentile
2. Level 1 on Statewide Assessments
3. Attendance Below 90 Percent

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	Math lowest 25th percentile showed the greatest decline from the previous year. We scored 41% in this area, compared to 55% from the previous year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percentage of students making a learning gain, in the lowest quartile, in math will increase from 41% to 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Susan Sanders (ssanders@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increased use of standards-based, hands-on math instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Lowest quartile math students will benefit from this more applicable approach to understanding the how and why of solving mathematical equations. Lessons will include opportunities for a more concrete, multi-sensory development of number sense and operations.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will attend school-based professional development throughout the year from the district math department. Grade levels will discuss implementation of the new strategies at weekly collaborative meetings. 2. Teachers will attend professional development on iReady. They will utilize reports to target and determine needs of individual students and form instructional groups. Teachers will use the data to provide additional instruction for students who are in the lowest quartile in math. 3. Continued implementation of Whole Brain Teaching multi-sensory strategies. 4. A school data team, consisting of one member per grade level, will meet with administration to discuss grade level data following each STAR and iReady assessment. Team members will meet with their grade levels to facilitate collaborative data meetings. Teachers will identify students in the lowest quartile in math and in all grade levels. They will utilize reports from iReady and STAR to form instructional groups and they will discuss how they plan to utilize district math curriculum frameworks and iReady instructional resources to meet the needs of students in the lowest quartile in math. 5. ESE teachers will collaborate regularly to discuss ability level strategies to meet the needs of all their SWD, specifically focusing on math.
Person Responsible	Susan Sanders (ssanders@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

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.

R.C. Lipscomb Elementary School receives TITLE 1, Part A funds and is developing a written Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) that establishes our expectations for parent and family engagement. This plan will describe how we will carry out the programs, activities, and procedures in accordance with the definitions in Section 81014 of ESEA. This plan is developed jointly and agreed upon with the families of children participating in TITLE 1, Part A programs.

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.

R.C. Lipscomb provides mentors for at risk students. These students meet with their mentor once a week. Students gain skills within independence and leadership. Students who are in need of a more therapeutic setting are referred to guidance for counseling. The school counselor then makes the decision if the student qualifies for counseling by a medical based provider. Our counseling team aids in the process of preparing and sending the needed documentation, in order to schedule the counseling sessions. Students who are in need of social skills may be requested to participate within a social skills group. Social skills groups instruct and foster appropriate peer and teacher social interactions. If the student's social-emotional needs are beyond what can be provided in the general education setting, the parents and school work together to form a plan that is appropriate for the student. A mental health counselor is on site 2 days per week to help address the needs of students who qualify for those services.

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

R. C. Lipscomb Elementary does not have a Title 1 Pre-K Program. Voluntary Pre-K students in Escambia County are served by private providers through Escambia County Readiness Coalition and the Escambia County School District at selected locations. Children that are enrolled at local preschools, such as Headstart, are given the opportunity to come and visit in our Kindergarten classes.

This past spring, our school offered "Kindergarten Story Time" for upcoming kindergarten students. These students were read a story by some of the kindergarten teachers. They also toured the school and took a bus ride on the bus ramp area. The administration gave the parents registration requirements and information about R.C. Lipscomb Elementary School. Many of our Kindergarten students have not had Pre-K experience. This means that our Kindergarten teachers have to back up their curriculum to meet the needs of the children coming into our Kindergarten classrooms. Our teachers do an outstanding job of transitioning preschool children into our public education.

All fifth grade students with an IEP have a progression meeting in the last quarter of the school year. This meeting provides an opportunity for the middle school and elementary school to collaborate providing a smooth transition to the next level of education. ESE teachers include a reading assessment in the student's CUM to help place students in an appropriate reading block.

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 will function as a Professional Learning Community that will help everyone at our school learn, implement, support, and share ideas related to RTI/MTSS and student improvement.

The Leadership Team will meet monthly to :
*Review policies and procedures, discuss items to be shared from various curriculum departments at grade level meetings.
*Develop and conduct professional development throughout the school year.
*Spend time analyzing Reading, Math, and Behavior data.
*Ensure implementation of RtI/MTSS is effective and strategies are implemented with fidelity.

At R.C. Lipscomb Elementary School the MTSS problem solving process is used in developing and implementing the school improvement plan by designing the goals and strategies to meet the needs of all students. Administration will conduct daily walkthroughs to ensure that teachers are engaging students and teaching from bell to bell. Small groups will be enhanced by the use of teacher assistants and inclusion ESE teachers. Funding will be used to purchase supplies and materials needed to increase student achievement and to purchase additional support personnel.

Title I, Part A
R. C. Lipscomb received Title 1 Grant money for the 2019-2020 school year. These funds will be used to purchase a .50 technology person, staff development, supplies, pay for substitute teachers for staff development, software, and parent involvement activities.

Title II
Professional learning opportunities are offered both at the school level and the district level.

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest 25th Percentile	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00