Manatee County Public Schools

H. S. Moody Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 9

Planning for Improvement 14

Title I Requirements 19

Budget to Support Goals 21

H. S. Moody Elementary School

5425 38TH AVE W, Bradenton, FL 34209

https://www.manateeschools.net/moody

Demographics

Principal: Natalie Jadid

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2017

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 (43%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (46%) 2014-15: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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 9

Planning for Improvement 14

Title I Requirements 19

Budget to Support Goals 21

H. S. Moody Elementary School

5425 38TH AVE W, Bradenton, FL 34209

https://www.manateeschools.net/moody

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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.

Moody Elementary will be an enthusiastic community of lifelong learners where dedication, collaboration, and high expectations will develop independent thinkers and empower tomorrow's leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is for students to use their thinking and problem solving skills to persevere in meeting their goals.

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
Stancil, Tina	Principal	Oversee instruction and assessments for every grade level; oversee MTSS; point person for third grade team.
Chapin-Clarke, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Point person for first grade team, support and monitoring use of PBIS
Sanchez, Rebeca	Teacher, K-12	Point person for second grade team, ESOL resource teacher- monitoring achievement of ELLs
Baker, Maidie	Assistant Principal	Monitoring instruction and assessments, grade level point person for fourth grade.
Findlay, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Instructional point person for kindergarten team
Vicencio, Lindsay	Instructional Coach	Grade level point person for fifth grade, support person for ELA coaching, part of MTSS team

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	94	95	96	108	94	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	588
Attendance below 90 percent	5	15	21	19	21	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	2	11	16	13	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	43	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	1	5	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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)

30

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 6/30/2019

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	9	3	8	8	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	37	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	9	3	8	8	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	37	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	36%	52%	57%	41%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	57%	58%	51%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	55%	53%	51%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	63%	63%	49%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	68%	62%	53%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	53%	51%	53%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	48%	53%	31%	42%	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	94 (0)	95 (0)	96 (0)	108 (0)	94 (0)	101 (0)	588 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 (9)	15 (3)	21 (8)	19 (8)	21 (10)	17 (9)	98 (47)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	11 (0)	16 (0)	13 (1)	13 (0)	19 (0)	74 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (17)	43 (37)	38 (36)	81 (90)

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	31%	51%	-20%	58%	-27%
	2018	36%	49%	-13%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	56%	-23%	58%	-25%
	2018	35%	51%	-16%	56%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	37%	52%	-15%	56%	-19%
	2018	47%	52%	-5%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	44%	60%	-16%	62%	-18%
	2018	46%	56%	-10%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	65%	-9%	64%	-8%
	2018	43%	61%	-18%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	38%	60%	-22%	60%	-22%
	2018	58%	58%	0%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	32%	48%	-16%	53%	-21%
	2018	47%	49%	-2%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
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	16	34	36	24	39	30	22				

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	24	40	44	39	54	45	16				
BLK	19	31	50	27	41	40					
HSP	33	48	36	47	58	40	37				
MUL	42	46		58	62						
WHT	49	58	55	63	59		48				
FRL	35	49	46	48	56	37	31				

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	21	43	43	37	54	43	52				
ELL	22	38	44	39	40	32	17				
BLK	22	44	46	33	38	38	22				
HSP	40	46	42	52	55	32	46				
MUL	33			56							
WHT	60	64	58	65	64		67				
FRL	38	49	45	49	52	38	42				

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	20	47	46	29	55	53	13				
ELL	14	50	55	35	53	43	7				
BLK	29	33	55	29	33	33	12				
HSP	32	50	50	43	59	56	29				
MUL	50	50		33							
WHT	57	60	50	66	56	70	39				
FRL	35	49	47	45	54	54	26				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	361
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	30
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	45
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	52
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	
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	55
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	45
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.

There are four areas of the school grade that are of particular concern: ELA proficiency, ELA and math gains of the lowest quartile, and science proficiency. A trend is that we are not able to score at least 60 in the lowest quartile.

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

The area with the greatest decline was science, moving from 48% proficient in 2018 to 34% proficient in 2019. 2018 was the largest percent proficient in science for the past four years. This percentage mirrored the percent proficient of fifth graders who were proficient in ELA. In 2019, the percentage of fifth graders proficient was 36%.

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.

ELA proficiency has the greatest gap comparing school data to state data. The school's percent proficient decreased by 6 percentile points from 2018. The percent proficient in 2018 was 42. This is the highest percent proficient for the school in 3 years. There had been a small, but steady increase. A factor that may have contributed to the decline was a turnover rate of 50% in the teachers on staff at the school for fourth and fifth grades. The teacher with the highest scores in 2018 transferred to another school.

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

The only area that showed any improvement was in math learning gains by 2 percentile points. The school implemented an additional half hour of math instruction in grades three through five. This additional half hour is dedicated to ability groups for math.

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

The area of greatest concern are the 46 fourth graders in 2019 who scored a level 1 in ELA. This is approximately half of our current fifth graders.

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

1. Increase ELA FSA scores in proficiency and gains, including the lowest quartile.
2. Increase math FSA scores in proficiency and gains, including the lowest quartile.
3. Reduce the number of out of school suspensions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increasing FSA ELA proficiency and gains
Rationale	A focus on supporting readers to become proficient with grade level text will support our students to be successful in school and beyond.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Proficiency 44% Learning gains 56% Lowest quartile gains 70%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	SRA implementation for students in grades two through five. LAFS implementation for students in grades two through five.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	SRA was selected due to the results from other Title I schools in the District. The level of evidence is the higher percentages of learning gains, including the lowest quartile, at higher needs Title I schools. Additionally, Hattie (2009) synthesis states that there is an effect size of .60 for phonics instruction. SRA in the elementary level is primarily targeting phonics. LAFS was selected due to being a common resources that can be used consistently among and across grades to provide grade level text to students. Small group instruction will be the structure to be used with LAFS. LAFS was a common resource with a Title I school in the District that moved from a D to an A in 2019. This particular school increased in learning gains and proficiency.
Action Step	
Description	1. Assess all second through fifth grade students with the SRA placement test. 2. Order materials 3. Train teachers and para 4. Determine in the daily schedule when SRA will take place. 5. Monitoring of SRA data
Person Responsible	Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)

#2	
Title	Increasing FSA Math proficiency and gains
Rationale	Student proficiency is important for students to exhibit an understanding of grade level math concepts to be successful in school and beyond.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Proficiency 53% Learning gains 60% Lowest quartile gains 61%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	According to Hattie (2009) the highest effects in mathematics was given when teachers provided feedback to students (d=0.71). Therefore, teachers will be providing feedback to students that is timely for exit tickets and formative assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for this strategy is the research synthesized by Hattie (2009). Grade level common exit tickets, and formative assessments will be used. In addition, the pre/post monthly Acaletics scrimmage provideds timely feedback to students.
Action Step	
Description	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Sub-group ELL
Rationale	The ELL population is performing below the 40% indicator for success.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May, 2020 40% of all ELLs will perform on grade level according to FSA ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	ELLs who are not on grade level will be provided SRA instruction on a daily basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	SRA has been identified as a resource that is used in other Title I schools that are seeing a significant improvement in ELA proficiency and gains according to FSA. In 2018-2019, Palm View Elementary moved from a D to an A school based on the school grading system.
Action Step	
Description	1. Assess all students in grades two through five who are not proficient according to FSA 2. Determine materials needed and train staff 3. Implement program 5 days-a-week 4. Monitor progress of students using 2 Inform data base 5. Provide additional professional development for teachers if necessary
Person Responsible	Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)

#4	
Title	Sub-group African American
Rationale	African-American subgroup is not performing at 40% proficiency or higher.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May 2020, 40% of the African-American sub group will perform on grade level according to the ELA on FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	African American students who are not on grade level will be provided SRA instruction on a daily basis
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	SRA has been identified as a resource that is used in other Title I schools that are seeing a significant improvement in ELA proficiency and gains according to FSA. In 2018-2019, Palm View Elementary moved from a D to an A school based on the school grading system.
Action Step	
Description	1. Assess all students in grades two through five who are not proficient according to FSA 2. Determine materials needed and train staff 3. Implement program 5 days-a-week 4. Monitor progress of students using 2 Inform data base 5. Provide additional professional development for teachers if necessary 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)

#5	
Title	Sub-group ESE
Rationale	ESE subgroup is not performing at 40% proficiency or higher
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May 2020, 40% of the ESE sub group will perform on grade level according to the ELA on FSA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	ESE students who are not on grade level will be provided SRA instruction on a daily basis
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	SRA has been identified as a resource that is used in other Title I schools that are seeing a significant improvement in ELA proficiency and gains according to FSA. In 2018-2019, Palm View Elementary moved from a D to an A school based on the school grading system.
Action Step	
Description	1. Assess all students in grades two through five who are not proficient according to FSA 2. Determine materials needed and train staff 3. Implement program 5 days-a-week 4. Monitor progress of students using 2 Inform data base 5. Provide additional professional development for teachers if necessary
Person Responsible	Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

Referrals and Suspensions- We will be using 1 MTSS meeting per month to review behavior data. This data will be used to schedule meetings with teachers to discuss how to improve student behavior.

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.

Attached is Moody's plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders. In addition to the plan, we have created a partnership with a local church, First Church of the Nazarene Bradenton (FCNB) currently has 12 volunteers regularly supporting in classrooms. They are also providing needed clothing and supplies for students.

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.

We provide a Kindergarten Round-Up every spring for students entering school with tours of the school for parents and students.

We will invite middle school counselors to meet with 5th grade students in order to explain middle school expectations and scheduling considerations. We will invite our 5th grade parents and students to attend a parent night in the spring where they will have the opportunity to meet with counselors and/or principals from our feeder middle schools.

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

Monthly grade-level Data meetings are held with classroom teachers, intervention teachers, principal, assistant principal and curriculum resource teacher to analyze data and progress of Tier 1 students. Additionally, during these monthly meetings the progress of students receiving intervention and Tier 2 and Tier 3 services are analyzed. The results of these meetings are shared with the MTSS/PS/RTI team where problem solving is conducted for students in need of further support. Weekly, (MTSS/PS/RTI Team) to discuss students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in academics and behavior. This information resulted in a identifying the need for 2 instructional intervention teachers who are working on a daily basis with the lowest performing students in reading at each grade level. Additionally, Moody's media specialist is working with our highest performing students on a daily basis to provide enrichment opportunities to extend their learning. The principal is responsible to ensure the meetings are scheduled with the appropriate personnel in attendance. The school's counselor, reading coach, and administrative team coordinate the data needed for the grade level meetings. Title I funds are monitored by the school's principal to ensure that the funds are being utilized for the areas identified in the Title I plan and the SIP. During the 2019-2020 school year, teachers will be provided professional learning throughout the year with substitutes in the classroom during the professional learning in areas that are identified in the SIP. The school's administrative team, literacy coach, and Student Support Specialist work together to create the schedule and the professional development.

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.

Students are provided with the readers from the community who provide some background to college and careers.

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

Career days are encouraged at each grade level.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing FSA ELA proficiency and gains	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing FSA Math proficiency and gains	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Sub-group ELL	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Sub-group African American	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Sub-group ESE	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00