

The School District of Palm Beach County

Loxahatchee Groves Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Loxahatchee Groves Elementary

16020 OKEECHOBEE BLVD, Loxahatchee, FL 33470

<https://lges.palmbeachschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Richard Myerson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/20/2004

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Palm Beach 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Loxahatchee Groves Elementary

16020 OKEECHOBEE BLVD, Loxahatchee, FL 33470

<https://lges.palmbeachschools.org>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">67%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">46%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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.

Loxahatchee Groves Elementary School's mission is to engage and empower all of our students through a STEAM based educational platform supporting the attainment of their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Loxahatchee Groves Elementary School is to create a safe and supportive environment in which students will be able to excel academically, take ownership of their learning, and find the great enthusiasms that will fire their curiosity and passion for lifelong learning, discovery, and creativity. Our students will ASK critical questions, IMAGINE possibilities, PLAN collaboratively, CREATE innovative solutions, and IMPROVE continuously.

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
Myerson, Richard	Principal	Oversee and monitor implementation and fidelity of SIP goals and strategies.
Joy, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to team, and monitor areas of responsibility.
Tetreault, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to team, and monitor areas of responsibility.
Levitt, Sharyn	Teacher, K-12	Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to team, and monitor areas of responsibility.
Ireland, Shira	Teacher, K-12	Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to team, and monitor areas of responsibility.
Rubenstien, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to team, and monitor areas of responsibility.
Lalama, Lindsay	Teacher, K-12	Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to team, and monitor areas of responsibility.
Manuel, Marco	Teacher, K-12	Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to team, and monitor areas of responsibility.
Quinn, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to team, and monitor areas of responsibility.
Martin, Anita	Other	Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to team, and monitor areas of responsibility.
Bradley, Juliana	Assistant Principal	Oversee and monitor implementation and fidelity of SIP goals and strategies.
D'angelo, Renee	Teacher, PreK	Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to team, and monitor areas of responsibility.
Grimes, Elizabeth	Teacher, PreK	Collaborate in drafting SIP, disseminate information regarding initiatives and strategies to team, and monitor areas of responsibility.

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	68	69	75	98	76	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	476
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	15	13	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	18	24	34	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	13	5	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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)

55

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

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	19	19	12	10	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	23	24	14	16	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	15	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	3	9	3	9	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	19	19	12	10	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	23	24	14	16	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	15	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	3	9	3	9	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	61%	58%	57%	52%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	63%	58%	57%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	56%	53%	62%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	79%	68%	63%	67%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	68%	62%	61%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	59%	51%	49%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	51%	53%	61%	51%	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	68 (0)	69 (0)	75 (0)	98 (0)	76 (0)	90 (0)	476 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (19)	6 (19)	15 (12)	13 (10)	6 (9)	8 (15)	48 (84)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	0 (1)	3 (3)	1 (4)	7 (8)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (7)	18 (23)	24 (24)	34 (14)	14 (16)	14 (29)	104 (113)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (13)	15 (15)	23 (28)	38 (56)

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	65%	54%	11%	58%	7%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	62%	-10%	58%	-6%
	2018	54%	58%	-4%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	63%	59%	4%	56%	7%
	2018	60%	59%	1%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	65%	13%	62%	16%
	2018	72%	63%	9%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	67%	6%	64%	9%
	2018	61%	63%	-2%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	75%	65%	10%	60%	15%
	2018	72%	66%	6%	61%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	25	42	52	44	70	68	14				

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	34	52	56	67	79	60	21				
BLK	65			82							
HSP	49	60	67	74	75	60	33				
WHT	66	51	41	82	67	71	68				
FRL	51	56	59	73	72	61	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	24	39	47	41	57	42	50				
ELL	21	48	45	59	59	60					
BLK	50	62		56	31						
HSP	48	57	47	68	58	42	55				
WHT	65	65	44	77	58	50	70				
FRL	52	60	44	66	54	47	52				
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	24	41	54	41	58	46	44				
ELL	17	56	73	50	50	55					
BLK	43	75		65	65						
HSP	34	45	53	58	60	47	38				
MUL	50			80							
WHT	64	58	60	71	60	31	69				
FRL	44	55	67	61	61	61	55				

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	63
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	502
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	74
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	59
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	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	60
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.

5th grade science scores were the lowest in the school. Science proficiency dropped from 59% to 52%. In FY19, one new teacher was teaching all of 5th grade science. For FY20, two teachers will be teaching 5th grade science, one of which will take the role of mentor of the other science teacher to coach and support.

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

5th grade science scores showed the greatest decline. In FY19, one new teacher was teaching all of 5th grade science. Science proficiency dropped from 59% to 52%. For FY20, two teachers will be teaching 5th grade science, one of which will take the role of mentor of the other science teacher to coach and support.

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

5th grade science scores had the largest gap between the school at 52% and the state average at 53%. All other categories were above the state average.

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

Math Learning Gains improved by 26%. We followed Central Region-2's math program with more fidelity and also provided more small group instruction. Teachers collaborated in PLCs's and planned out their lessons, assessments, and reteaching. Administration held data chats following each USA to determine next steps for instruction.

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 concern as 48 students were absent more than 10% of the days of school.

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

1. increasing ELL proficiency
2. Increasing Science proficiency
3. Decreasing chronic absenteeism
4. Implementing Social/Emotional Learning PreK-5 through Morning Meetings

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	To ensure progress towards science proficiency to align with the District's Strategic Plan LTO #2 To Ensure High School Readiness.
Rationale	Science proficiency dropped from 57% to 52% which is one point lower than the State proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May 2020, 60% of students in 5th grade will score a level 3 or higher on the FY20 SSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Richard Myerson (richard.myerson@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will focus on integrated progression of Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic vocabulary from grades K through 5. 2. Teachers will facilitate integration of science content through ELA nonfiction curriculum grades K-5. 3. Teachers will normalize the utilization of concept mapping/graphic organizer K-5. 4. Teachers will develop and integrate test taking strategies utilizing school-wide common language and procedures for grades K-5.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To help students understand science concepts utilizing grade level appropriate language. 2. To build background knowledge to support the conceptual understanding of science. 3. To help students understand science concepts and key terms in depth. 4. To help promote students' engagement in close reading of science texts and selection of appropriate evidence
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Share best practices and collaborate during PLCs 2. Participate in vertical PLCs to develop key terminology/vocabulary by grade 3. Develop and utilize grade level concept maps/graphic organizers in PLCs 4. Develop school-wide test-taking strategies and protocols
Person Responsible	Richard Myerson (richard.myerson@palmbeachschools.org)

#2	
Title	To ensure progress towards ELL student achievement in ELA proficiency to align with the District's Strategic Plan LTO #2 To Ensure High School Readiness.
Rationale	Historically, our ELL population has the lowest performance in achievement in ELA. Each year, LGES has an increasing enrollment of beginning and emerging speakers according to the ELDC. Only 6% of the ELL students scored level 3 or higher on the FY19 ELA FSA.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May 2020, 33% of the ELL students in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 or higher on the FY20 ELA FSA. This is an increase from FY19's 24% level 3 or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jennifer Tetreault (jennifer.tetreault@palmbeachschools.org.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will receive daily explicit vocabulary instruction K-5 throughout the content areas. 2. Teachers will expose students to grade level text through shared reading, choral reading, and reading aloud 3. Teachers will utilize and teach students to use common language for close reading strategies. 4. Students will participate in small group instruction with a focus on the grade level standards, oral language, and reading behaviors.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of Explicit Vocabulary Instruction will increase students' oral language and comprehension. 2. Students will become more fluent readers which in turn will increase their comprehension. 3. Using common language for close reading strategies will increase their comprehension with increased automaticity. 4. Differentiated small groups will impact their fluency and comprehension

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train all teachers and CLFs on ESOL Go-To-Strategies and best practices. 2. One-on-one coaching to individual staff members by Area ESOL Specialist. 3. Train all staff on explicit vocabulary instruction through PDD and PLCs. 4. Use of PLC time to collaborate between ESOL teacher and ELA teacher on differentiate planning.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Tetreault (jennifer.tetreault@palmbeachschools.org.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous task encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 with a focus on reading and writing across all content areas. Our students focus on content and curriculum related to:

The History of the Holocaust

The History of Black and African Americans

The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics

The Contributions of Women

The Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols, and monitoring SwPBS through data. In alignment, to school board 2.09 and Florida State statue 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. Our students participate in activities and studies including the study of music of different eras and countries and in media our library selection is filled with books related to the variety of cultures.

We also implement Social Emotional Learning school-wide and utilize Morning Meetings as one way to cultivate and foster relationships in the classroom. Our staff will be trained on Welcoming and Inclusive School's Policies and Implementation.

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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: To ensure progress towards science proficiency to align with the District's Strategic Plan LTO #2 To Ensure High School Readiness.				\$800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1381	622-Audio Visual Materials Non-Capitalized	1901 - Loxahatchee Groves Elementary	School Improvement Funds		\$800.00
<i>Notes: Purchase Generation Genius schools wide</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To ensure progress towards ELL student achievement in ELA proficiency to align with the District's Strategic Plan LTO #2 To Ensure High School Readiness.				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1530	590-Other Materials and Supplies	1901 - Loxahatchee Groves Elementary	School Improvement Funds		\$500.00
<i>Notes: Beginning literacy materials of high interest</i>						
Total:						\$1,300.00