Parker Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Parker Elementary School

640 S HIGHWAY 22 A, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Chris Coan

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2017

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 (47%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (47%) 2014-15: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

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 Bay 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

Parker Elementary School

640 S HIGHWAY 22 A, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

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	88%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay 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.

Parker Elementary School (PES) seeks to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success of all students through developmentally appropriate instruction that acknowledges individual differences and learning styles.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of all Parker Elementary School stakeholders is to meet the needs of all students by granting them diverse educational opportunities by means of:
• Instruction designed to prepare students for mastery of Florida State Standards.
• Learning that develops skills for students to improve in language arts, mathematics, and school safety.
• Opportunities to exhibit responsibilities and promote self-esteem.
• Teamwork to become productive citizens.

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
Coan, Christopher	Principal	Principal of School
Barron, Christen	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of School, MTSS, Discipline
Hurst, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	MTSS Behavior and Academic Coach
Turner, Ruth	Teacher, K-12	KDG Team Lead
McGee, Marian	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Team Lead
Hitzeman, Isabelle	School Counselor	Guidance PreK-2. MTSS Academic
Sapp, Minnie	Teacher, K-12	Special Area Team Lead
Wolff, Bethany	School Counselor	Guidance 3rd - 5th Grade, MTSS Academic
Marcino, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Team Lead
Henson, Teresa	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team Lead
Been, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Team Lead
Segrest-Adams, Katrina	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Team Lead
Holmes, Shante	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Team Lead

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	97	83	90	99	107	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	588
Attendance below 90 percent	19	30	30	25	38	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	0	7	4	10	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	3	10	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	37	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	3	3	9	28	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	3	4	2	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	2	2	10	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 9/16/2019

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	27	22	21	27	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	3	3	5	15	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	19	12	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	14	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	5	8	24	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	27	22	21	27	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	3	3	5	15	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	19	12	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	14	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	5	8	24	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	43%	55%	57%	41%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	59%	58%	60%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	57%	53%	66%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	36%	56%	63%	42%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	48%	54%	62%	46%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	42%	51%	45%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	53%	53%	43%	44%	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	97 (0)	83 (0)	90 (0)	99 (0)	107 (0)	112 (0)	588 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	19 (27)	30 (22)	30 (21)	25 (27)	38 (12)	45 (18)	187 (127)
One or more suspensions	0 (3)	7 (3)	4 (5)	10 (15)	14 (4)	17 (11)	52 (41)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	3 (4)	3 (19)	10 (12)	5 (12)	14 (27)	35 (74)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (44)	37 (14)	58 (27)	104 (85)

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	38%	61%	-23%	58%	-20%
	2018	39%	57%	-18%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	58%	-25%	58%	-25%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	56%	-6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	47%	56%	-9%	56%	-9%
	2018	53%	50%	3%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	30%	62%	-32%	62%	-32%
	2018	38%	63%	-25%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	59%	-16%	64%	-21%
	2018	56%	59%	-3%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	37%	54%	-17%	60%	-23%
	2018	43%	57%	-14%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	54%	-11%	53%	-10%
	2018	55%	54%	1%	55%	0%
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	26	48		15	21	23	30				
ELL											
BLK	32	56		34	37		30				
HSP	52			33							
MUL	50	45		44	55						
WHT	42	51	54	33	51	40	56				
FRL	43	53	63	35	47	35	45				

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	26	48	44	25	49	59	45				
BLK	30	53		31	50		30				
HSP	76	70		71	70						
MUL	61			44							
WHT	47	61	55	42	56	62	64				
FRL	41	57	56	35	55	68	55				

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	23	58	57	29	41	39	15				
BLK	26	59	69	23	39	35	35				
HSP	58	67		54	58						
MUL	38	80		43	45						
WHT	45	58	65	47	49	50	38				
FRL	38	59	64	38	46	44	36				

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	21
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	347
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

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	21
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students 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	47
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	44
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.

4th Grade Reading and 5th Grade Math showed the lowest performance. As for 5th grade Math, it was the teacher's first year teaching at that grade level and that content. 4th grade Reading is lower than previous year, but comparable to cohortal data.

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

5th Grade Math showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Teacher was new to grade level, learning the content, and had the task of a large concentration of ESE and Tier II and III students.

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 percent proficient compared to the state average is the greatest gap. While the learning gains are appropriate, the number of students obtaining a proficient score in ELA and Math is behind the state average. This is based on the number of students that are currently receiving MTSS interventions or have an IEP.

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

5th Grade Lowest ELA Quartile showed the most improvement. This teacher is an amazing teacher and has taught multiple years at this grade level.

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 obtaining a level 1 on state assessments, and we need to improve our students ability to be successful on the FSA.

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

1. Improve ELA proficiency
2. Improve Math proficiency
3. Maintain Learning Gains in ELA
4. Improve attendance (number of students missing 90% or more) (Hurricane Michael factored into this.)
5. Implementation of new EL curriculum

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Reading
Rationale	Improving the ELA curriculum delivery to students using the new EL curriculum - Currently ELA proficiency scores are 12% behind the district and 14% behind the state average for proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improve the overall ELA % proficient from 43% in 2018-2019 to 50% in 2019-2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	EL Curriculum Implementation and fidelity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This is a brand new curriculum that will be implemented for strengthening and embedding grade level appropriate text. In addition, we plan to increase small group, focused instruction.
Action Step	
Description	1. Lesson Plans: Teachers will upload to Planbook and administration will be able to check for lesson planning and preparation. 2. PLC Notes: Teachers will submit to Leadership Team. These will include all information discussed and Tier II interventions and student that are receiving these services. 3. Common Assessments: Teachers will give and analyze data from these common assessments during their PLC meetings. 4. Classroom Walk-Thrus: Administration, coaches, and district support will frequently conduct classroom visits. 5. Master Schedule: Master schedule is aligned so that we can maximize of all personnel at the benefit of our students' instructional time.
Person Responsible	Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Mathematics
Rationale	Improving the math curriculum delivery to students - Currently math proficiency scores are 20% behind the district and 27% behind the state average for proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improve the overall Math % proficient from 36% in 2018-2019 to 43% in 2019-2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Eureka Curriculum Implementation and fidelity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We will reassign staff members to new areas of academic concentration. In addition, we plan to increase small group, focused instruction.
Action Step	
Description	1. Lesson Plans: Teachers will upload to Planbook and administration will be able to check for lesson planning and preparation. 2. PLC Notes: Teachers will submit to Leadership Team. These will include all information discussed and Tier II interventions and student that are receiving these services. 3. Common Assessments: Teachers will give and analyze data from these common assessments during their PLC meetings. 4. Classroom Walk-Thrus: Administration, coaches, and district support will frequently conduct classroom visits. 5. Master Schedule: Master schedule is aligned so that we can maximize of all personnel at the benefit of our students' instructional time.
Person Responsible	Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Behavior and Attendance
Rationale	Our goal is for a decrease in discipline referrals and an increase in our students' daily percentage attendance rate.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decrease the overall amount discipline referrals from in 281 in 2018-2019 to 250 in 2019-2020. Increase the daily percentage attendance rate from 89% to 92% for the school year of 2019-2020
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Behavior and Attendance Data and implementation of "Strong Kids"
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	With the decrease of students missing academic instruction time from discipline referrals, we will be able to increase quality instructional time.
Action Step	
Description	BEHAVIOR: 1. FOCUS Date: Behavior data will be analyzed to determine which students are of concern. 2. PROMISE Room Utilization/Data: Utilization of the PROMISE Room will be tracked for all students. 3. Behavior Tracking Form: All discipline will be tracked and analyzed for any discipline incidents and referrals will be written as needed. 4. Tiers II and III Data: Behavior will be documented for all students receiving Tier II and III behavior interventions. ATTENDANCE: 1. FOCUS Date: Attendance data will be analyzed to determine which students are of concern. 2. Attendance Tracking: Daily tracking occurs, home calls/visits are completed as needed, CST or Truancy Court referral as needed, weekly rewards given to our "Attendance Group" as earned
Person Responsible	Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

The Master Schedule will be developed with our Support Staff members in mind to maximize small group instruction. Additionally, daily classroom walk-thrus will be conducted by administration ensuring that the program is being implemented with fidelity. Lesson plans are collected thru Planbook, and reviewed by administration. PLC meetings facilitated by the leadership team will be conducted weekly and notes will be submitted to administration.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

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.

The school will conduct two separate Title I Annual meetings at different times to accommodate the needs of the parents. One of the meetings will be in the evening in conjunction with our Fall Open House. Additional meetings and times will be added in alignment with other parental involvement activities scheduled in the first month of the school year. The parents will be notified via flyers sent home with each child, school newsletters sent out by administration, school wide Class Dojo alerts, and class newsletters. Information will be placed on social media, as well as the marquee in the front of the school.

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.

At Parker Elementary School, all students in the pre-kindergarten program are assessed prior to exiting in order to check for mastery of the Florida Early Learning and Developmental Standards for Four Year Olds. Each child is given the Florida Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK) assessment three times during the school year. These tests correlate with the Florida VPK standards and show any developmental growth throughout the school year. All pre-kindergarten students are taught and evaluated on the following areas:

*Physical Health
*Approaches to Learning
*Social and Emotional
*Language and Communication
*Emergent Literacy
*Mathematical and Scientific Learning
*Social Studies
*Motor Development
All evaluations are documented and kept in a student's cumulative file.

As for Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Pre-Kindergarten students, they are assessed twice yearly using the Brigance Inventory of Early Development. This test is designed to evaluate students in the areas of literacy and math skills.

All incoming kindergarten students are assessed in order to determine individual and group needs. The Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS) is given within the first thirty days of school to assess the readiness of each incoming kindergarten student as well as the Number Sense Screener.

All 5th grade students attend a transition day at Everitt Middle School in the spring. Everitt also attends many PES functions and provides information to parents concerning academics and clubs.

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

The School/MTSS Leadership Team reviewed all school data in the summer of 2019; emphasizing the use of data-driven dialogue. Areas of special interest were academics, attendance, and behavior data. To address academic needs, the school is implementing the new EL program for Reading and will continue to implement Eureka for Math. Teachers will follow pacing guides developed by the district in all subject areas. To address behavior and attendance needs, teachers will implement the "Strong Kids" social skills curriculum. Weekly/Monthly attendance incentives will also be used.

Title I dollars have been allocated to retain a Behavior Intervention Specialist for the 2019-2020 school year. This interventionist is instrumental in assisting teachers with classroom management and student behavior interventions. Other duties include scheduling and providing interventions for MTSS Tier 3 academic and behavior students.

Title I monies have been used to purchase additional paraprofessionals for every classroom to facilitate small groups for all students.

Parker Elementary School Leadership Team meets monthly to review school-wide data to identify students in need of core, supplemental, and intervention instruction. MAP data and common summative assessments in reading and math will be used to determine the effectiveness of the school plan compared to other schools.

All faculty and staff will participate in an interactive book study, "Working with Parents: Building Relationships for Student Success" to be discussed during an on-line discussion forum.

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.

Parents will complete evaluation forms at parenting events and review and discuss parent/teacher compacts at IEP meetings, parent-teacher conferences, and CST meetings. Parent input will be gathered at SAC and PTO (conducted monthly) meetings also. In addition, administrators, guidance counselors, the behavior interventionist, and the parent liaison are all connected to each teachers class DOJO account, where parents have the ability to communicate with school stakeholders.

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 - Elementary School

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Reading**	**$0.00**
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Mathematics**	**$0.00**
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Behavior and Attendance**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**