

The School District of Palm Beach County

# Morikami Park Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

# Morikami Park Elementary School

6201 MORIKAMI PARK RD, Delray Beach, FL 33484

<https://mpess.palmbeachschools.org>

## Demographics

**Principal: Stephanie Coletto**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2011

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	26%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (91%) 2017-18: A (84%) 2016-17: A (83%) 2015-16: A (86%) 2014-15: A (89%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

# Morikami Park Elementary School

6201 MORIKAMI PARK RD, Delray Beach, FL 33484

<https://mpess.palmbeachschools.org>

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	19%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

Working together with Open and Inquiring minds to develop Responsible and Respectful citizens who are Lifelong learners Dedicated to success within a global society.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Morikami Park Elementary School is committed to excellence in “Educating Today’s Children for Tomorrow’s World.”

### 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
Quinones, Stacey	Principal	Provides curriculum assistance, develops systems for school, provides teachers, staff, students and family support.
Hodge-Hargrove, Tonya	Assistant Principal	Assists with instructional support, provides PD for K-2 with reading record, supports new educators
Mercier, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Magnet Coordinator, oversees our choice program IB PYP and provides math intervention
Saraceni, Eve	School Counselor	Provides counseling services to students and parents, assists students with academic success, SBT Leader
Lamb, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	SAI teachers, provides reading and writing intervention, provides reading PD
Deckelmann, Danielle	Teacher, ESE	ESE contact and ESE .5 teacher, meets with parents and work with students
DiLorenzo, Kim	Teacher, ESE	Provide Speech and Language services and family support
Campos, Melissa	Attendance/ Social Work	School Behavioral Professional-provides short term counseling to students and parents, assists with community resources.

### 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	137	139	139	129	121	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	795
Attendance below 90 percent	4	5	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	11	6	16	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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)**

43

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 7/15/2019

**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	7	3	2	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	7	7	9	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

**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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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	7	3	2	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	7	7	9	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

## 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	96%	58%	57%	92%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	85%	63%	58%	71%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	85%	56%	53%	68%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	98%	68%	63%	96%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	89%	68%	62%	81%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	94%	59%	51%	83%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	88%	51%	53%	91%	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	137 (0)	139 (0)	139 (0)	129 (0)	121 (0)	130 (0)	795 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	4 (7)	5 (3)	3 (2)	1 (3)	2 (4)	1 (4)	16 (23)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	10 (12)	11 (7)	6 (7)	16 (9)	18 (9)	10 (2)	71 (46)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (2)	2 (1)	4 (3)

### 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	95%	54%	41%	58%	37%
	2018	95%	56%	39%	57%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	97%	62%	35%	58%	39%
	2018	94%	58%	36%	56%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	95%	59%	36%	56%	39%
	2018	94%	59%	35%	55%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	98%	65%	33%	62%	36%
	2018	96%	63%	33%	62%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	95%	67%	28%	64%	31%
	2018	99%	63%	36%	62%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	98%	65%	33%	60%	38%
	2018	96%	66%	30%	61%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	88%	51%	37%	53%	35%
	2018	86%	56%	30%	55%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	88	77	75	88	80	87	64				

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	100			93							
ASN	97	92		100	100		100				
BLK	93	76		97	86		91				
HSP	98	87	94	98	85	92	88				
MUL	86	70		93	80						
WHT	95	86	89	98	90	97	88				
FRL	92	72	68	96	87	96	72				
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	88	79	83	84	69	73	75				
ASN	100	100		100	74						
BLK	89	81	85	89	65	58	79				
HSP	92	73	71	95	75	70	79				
MUL	92			100							
WHT	96	78	83	98	72	80	89				
FRL	95	75	82	94	70	71	71				
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	72	57	57	87	75	73	60				
ASN	97	60		100	93		92				
BLK	86	63	70	95	70	73	87				
HSP	93	80	78	94	88	89	100				
MUL	90			100							
WHT	93	70	65	97	79	82	87				
FRL	84	64	63	95	66	71	91				

**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	91
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	635
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	80
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	97
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	98
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	89
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	92
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	82
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	92
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	83
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.**

ELA learning gains for FRL at 72%. FRL ELA achievement was at 92% but the students had difficulty demonstrating a learning gain. Majority of students ride the bus and are unable to attend before or after school support.

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

Multiracial students ELA proficiency decreased 6% points from 92% to 86%. Students were not able to stay after school for additional support or attend Saturday tutorial.

**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.**

Positive Gaps in ELA Proficiency compared to the state  
 Grade State Morikami  
 3 58% 95%  
 4 58% 97%  
 5 56% 95%

Math Proficiency-positive gaps compared to the state  
 Grade State Morikami  
 3 62% 98%  
 4 64% 95%  
 5 60% 98%  
 6 55% 100%

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

Hispanic students increased ELA performance by 6% points. Provide differentiated tier supports, morning and after school support.

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

Students attendance in grades 3-5 being attached to low performance.

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

1. Continued increase with 3rd grade ELA achievement. Stagnant at 95%
2. Continued increase with ELA learning gains to match proficiency percentage of school.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Increase reading on grade level by 3rd grade
<b>Rationale</b>	Students reading on grade level will achieve greater academic success. This area of focus aligns with the District's Strategic Plan to increase reading on grade level to 75% and ensure high school readiness.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase ELA 3rd grade proficiency by 2% points to continue to meet the LTO of the District's Strategic Plan.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Stacey Quinones (stacey.quinones@palmbeachschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Provide data driven differentiated small group instruction and tiered support for students.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	FSA data and iReady data was used in selecting this strategy. Teachers will use iReady data from the first diagnostic to strategically plan small group instruction that is specific to each students' needs. Tiered support will be specific to students' deficiency. Teachers will use LLI and Wilson to remediate student reading deficiencies.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<p>Pillars of Effective instructions: Students will be immersed in effective, rigorous and relevant standards based instruction, including content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity with a focus on Reading and writing across the content areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* K-2 will continue providing a systematic phonics program using Foundations</li> <li>* Continue with guaranteed academic vocabulary implementation</li> <li>* PLCs will focus on data analysis and instructional action plans will be developed</li> <li>* Teachers will continue implementation of mandated curriculum infusing multicultural texts, as applicable to appropriate grade levels including but not limited to: History of Holocaust, History of Africans and African Americans, Hispanic contributions, Women's contributions, Sacrifices of Veterans.</li> <li>* Teachers will continue to build content knowledge and vocabulary through leveled texts</li> <li>* Teachers will continue to expose students to complex text, aligning text, task, and talk</li> <li>* Teachers will teach inference skills, distinguishing between text-connecting and gap-filling inferences</li> <li>* Students will use iReady, IXL, and iReady prep books to build ELA skills</li> <li>* Teachers will disaggregate data (FSQs and USAs) looking for trends and patterns in each students' data and remediating as necessary.</li> <li>* Specific tiered supports will be provided to students</li> </ul>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Stacey Quinones (stacey.quinones@palmbeachschools.org)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	To increase ELA and Math learning gains for all students and low 25
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>Both math and ELA showed an increase from 2018 to 2019. Math demonstrated the largest increase from 73 to 89% learning gain for all students and low 25 from 75% to 94%. ELA demonstrated a 5% increase from 80% to 85% for both LG all and low 25 LG. This area of focus is aligned to the District's Strategic Plan to ensure high school readiness</p>
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>Increase ELA learning gains for all students and low 25 by 5% points to 90%.                  Increase Math learning gains for all students from 89% to 91%                  Increase Math learning gains for low 25 from 94% to 95%</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Stacey Quinones (stacey.quinones@palmbeachschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Student data (FSQs, USAs, iReady, formative assessments) will be analyzed for trends and patterns. Teachers will drill down data to specific standards not mastered and small skills group remediation will be provided.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Research shows that data driven instruction will have the biggest pay off in student achievement. The resources used were 2019 FSA data and iReady data. Data was analyzed and patterns were noted with specific standards that students struggled with and demonstrated that struggle on FSA.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<p>Students will be immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statue 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity with a focus on reading, writing, and math.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Develop a school-wide WIG for both ELA and Math</li> <li>* Teachers develop either a grade level goal or individual goal</li> <li>* Continued implementation of guaranteed vocabulary</li> <li>* Students will complete weekly iReady and Successmaker minutes</li> <li>* Students will be held accountable for standards taught by completing rigorous assignments and exit tickets</li> <li>* Teachers will teach inference skills, distinguishing between text-connecting and gap-filling inferences</li> <li>* Support services (Tier 2 and 3, SAI, before and after school tutorial) will be provided to students not meeting the standards</li> <li>* PLCs will focus on data analysis and instructional planning</li> <li>* Cross grade level collaboration to share best instructional practices</li> <li>* ELA intervention will be provided to students using LLI, Foundations, or Heggerty</li> <li>* Enrichment will be provided to students at FSA levels 4 &amp; 5</li> <li>* Students at grades 3-5 will have access to IXL math and reading</li> </ul>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Stacey Quinones (stacey.quinones@palmbeachschools.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 tasks 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 (Morikami Park Way) and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols and monitoring SwPBS through data. In alignment, to school board 2.09 and Florida State statute 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts and hosting an annual Multicultural Day. Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, art expos of different cultures and in music our students study music of different eras and countries and in media our library selection is filled with books related to the variety of cultures.

**Part V: Budget**

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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Increase reading on grade level by 3rd grade</b>				<b>\$3,500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1951 - Morikami Park Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$3,500.00
<i>Notes: after-school tutorial services</i>						
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: To increase ELA and Math learning gains for all students and low 25</b>				<b>\$2,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1951 - Morikami Park Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,000.00
<i>Notes: Tutorial services</i>						
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$5,500.00</b>