

Broward County Public Schools

Plantation 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Plantation Elementary School

651 NW 42ND AVE, Plantation, FL 33317

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Judith Pitter

Start Date for this Principal: 9/11/2019

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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: C (46%) 2014-15: F (26%)
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	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 Broward 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Plantation Elementary School

651 NW 42ND AVE, Plantation, FL 33317

[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	91%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	98%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

To provide the best learning environment opportunity for each child in order to develop his or her highest level of achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide an equitable learning environment conducive to learning through STEM.

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
Pitter, Judith	Principal	To promote and maintain high student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing and communicating information to enforce school, District and State policies.
Rhodes, Dana	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discipline/Behavior Support/Referrals • Supervise Faculty and Staff (PK-2 teachers, paras, custodians, guidance, ESE) • Classroom observations and teacher/custodial evaluations • Instructional support/student achievement • Facilitator and Coach for Math and Science • Lowest 25% student support • Bullying Investigative Designee • Threat Assessment
Rhodes, Dana	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments – benchmark, monthly, FSA • Reading Facilitation, Support, and Training • Coaching and Modeling • Test Prep materials and schedules • Academic Camps • Push-ins and additional Support • Administrative Designee • Instructional support/student achievement • Classroom observations • Lowest 25% student support -facilitator • School Operations • Classroom support • Testing Coordinator
White, Beverly	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate Math programs/instruction • Assessments • ACALETICS • IREADY • Coaching and Modeling • Instructional support/student achievement • Classroom support • Lowest 25% student support • School Operations
Jones, Vinson	Administrative Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate STEM programs/instruction • STEM Facilitation and Support • STEM Updates and Training • STEM Museum Nights • STEM IFC • Instructional support/student achievement • Lowest 25% student support • School Operations • Marketing and Promotion

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom Support • School Tours
Harley, Rafael	Teacher, ESE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional support/student achievement • Lowest 25% student support • Social Services for students School Operations • Guidance training for teachers/parents • Testing facilitation w/admin. • Chrysalis • Classroom support • Mentors • School Leaders • RTI • Bullying Prevention Liaison • SEL
Scott, Esther	Instructional Coach	Literacy Support K-2 – Esther Scott <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Facilitation, Support and Training • Assessments – benchmark, monthly, • Curriculum updates and training • Coaching and Modeling • Academic Nights and Fairs • Instructional support/student achievement • Lowest 25% student support • School Operations • Classroom support
Rodriguez, Carmen	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional support/student achievement • Lowest 25% student support • Social Services for students School Operations • Guidance training for teachers/parents • Testing facilitation w/admin. • Chrysalis • Classroom support • Mentors • School Leaders • RTI • Bullying Prevention Liaison • SEL

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	87	92	110	93	67	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	20	21	19	17	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	4	0	1	4	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	37	36	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107

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	2	1	29	17	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	8	4	27	1	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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

48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/11/2019

Prior Year - As Reported
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

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	20	21	19	17	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	4	0	1	4	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	37	36	31	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	3	2	1	29	17	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	47%	59%	57%	35%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	60%	58%	44%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	54%	53%	49%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	65%	63%	42%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	66%	62%	50%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	53%	51%	46%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	46%	53%	14%	45%	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	87 (0)	92 (0)	110 (0)	93 (0)	67 (0)	85 (0)	534 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	20 ()	21 ()	19 ()	17 ()	17 ()	22 ()	116 (0)
One or more suspensions	4 ()	0 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	9 (0)	7 (0)	25 (0)
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 (0)	37 (0)	36 (0)	34 (0)	107 (0)

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	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
	2018	45%	59%	-14%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	62%	-15%	58%	-11%
	2018	36%	58%	-22%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	48%	59%	-11%	56%	-8%
	2018	33%	56%	-23%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	65%	-9%	62%	-6%
	2018	55%	63%	-8%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	67%	-9%	64%	-6%
	2018	45%	63%	-18%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	53%	64%	-11%	60%	-7%
	2018	42%	62%	-20%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	49%	-14%	53%	-18%
	2018	34%	51%	-17%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	15	39	33	22	47	36					

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	46	56	54	50	59	53	26				
BLK	47	55	59	55	62	48	32				
HSP	37	75		58	57						
FRL	46	57	60	55	61	45	36				
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	19	29		32	39	33	20				
ELL	32	41	54	44	64	70	30				
BLK	37	45	40	45	58	55	31				
HSP	50	46		59	71						
FRL	39	44	40	48	61	53	37				
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	13	35		24	46						
ELL	25	43	59	43	52	47					
BLK	32	41	41	39	48	43	14				
HSP	53	71		53	64						
FRL	34	45	49	40	49	44	15				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	394
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	49
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	57
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the ELA achievement percentage which was 47%. Even though it was the lowest data component it was an improvement from the previous school year which was 40%. However, we were still below the district average of 60%. One of the contributing factors was the meeting the rigor of the standards in Tier 1 instruction. There is a significant increase in complexity from 3rd to 4th grade.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was the lowest quartile in math. We decreased 50% to 43% which is a 7 point decline. Our 4th-grade classes were grouped by ability and the instruction was no rigorous and did not meet the needs of the students in the lowest quartile.

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 data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the ELA achievement percentage. There was a 10 percentage point gap between the school and the state average. The gap is closing each year and we are working hard to build capacity through each grade level. The teachers had to work hard at teaching foundational skills while trying to accelerate the students.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was ELA lowest quartile. We went from 40% to 59% which was a 19 point increase. Targeted instruction was implemented daily to meet the needs of the students.

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

Our area of concern is our number of students that are in the at-risk, chronic and severely chronic attendance categories. According to our 2018-2019 data, we had 301 (49%) students who were categorized as at risk, chronic and severely chronic attenders.

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

1. RTI/MTSS
2. ELA proficiency
3. Math lowest quartile
4. Science proficiency
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title SWD ELA Achievement

Rationale Currently only 15% of our students with disabilities are proficient in ELA

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

On the 2020 FSA, SWD students will achieve increase on overall achievement for ELA, thus meeting the state required targets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Judith Pitter (judith.pitter@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy

IEP goals and objectives for all SWDs are aligned to the general education standards.
Teachers modify learning goals and instruction for students with a significant cognitive disability using the same, or similar, age-appropriate materials as those used by students without disabilities.
General and special education teachers can articulate what all students need to know, understand and be able to do in relation to the Florida Standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

General and special education teachers use the Florida Standards as the foundation for instruction of all Students with Disabilities

Action Step

Description

1. Analyze students data
2. Implementation of Researched based programs such as Leveled Literacy Intervention , Phonics for Reading
3. Data Chats
4. Supporting General Education Teachers with utilizing student's accomodations at all times.
- 5.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#2	
Title	ELA Achievement Grades 3-5
Rationale	This is an area of focus aligned with the district literacy initiative.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By Spring 2020 50% or more of students in grades 3-5 will score level 3 or above on the Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Judith Pitter (judith.pitter@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilizing Webbs Depth of Knowledge questioning technique QAR technique for comprehension Targeted Reading Instruction Small group Reading Differentiated Centers
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The above strategies were selected based on high effect size. Resources: Super QAR, Teach Like a Champion techniques, Rally,- New Reading Standards- Scholastic Resource Room
Action Step	
Description	1. Analyze students data 2. Lesson Study 3. Data Chats 4. Collaborative Planning 5. Professional Learning Communities
Person Responsible	Dana Rhodes (dana.rhodes@browardschools.com)

#3	
Title	
Rationale	
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).

SWD ELA Achievement will be addressed through targeted interventions, differentiated instruction, and continual progress monitoring used to drive subsequent instruction. A multi-tiered system of supports is utilized daily to ensure progress in the general education and with students with disabilities. School

personnel uses formative assessments to evaluate data about effective instruction and behavior interventions for all students with disabilities.

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.

SAC participation, curriculum night initiatives, STEM programs, and parent participation initiatives will be the drivers for accomplishing our goals as indicated in the PFEP for Plantation Elementary School. Additionally, partnerships with local businesses and other potential stakeholders will be sought.

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.

District mandated training is tracked for compliance by all staff; SEL instruction is provided to all students; referrals to outside agencies include, but are not limited to counseling, financial supports, and housing challenges. Additionally, mentoring programs take place year-round for both male and female students.

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

Vertical planning discussions are held with all receiving schools for each matriculating student to ensure that students needs and capabilities are understood.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The school employs various strategies and programs to improve student performance through the early warning system in BASIS 3.0. Students are identified as to their academic achievement levels through baseline data. Teachers assess students in K-5 using the Benchmark Assessment System in Reading. Teachers implement intervention strategies in the six areas of reading and pinpoint instruction to align with student needs. Once teachers pinpoint the area of need, they refer to the multi-tiered system of support to align the intervention. They also record the Tier II intervention to provide more intense reading instructional time. The intervention is recorded in BASIS 3.0. The teacher then monitors progress for 6 weeks through data collection to determine whether the student is responding to the intervention. The CPST/RtI team meets to discuss whether the student is making sufficient progress with the intervention or whether the student needs a more intensive intervention to make academic progress.

Teachers will employ rigorous Tier I instruction that employs the gradual release model, which works

towards student independence. This instruction includes frequent modeling, interactive Read Alouds, Accountable Talk, Close Reads, Shared reading and writing to ensure that all students are receiving rigorous Tier I instruction. Teachers will also ensure they are reaching all learners by employing visual, kinesthetic and auditory delivery models. The administration of the school is primarily responsible for the coordination of these services.

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

The school implements strategies in their daily curriculum that teaches the students 21st-century skills. We conduct lessons and activities that train our students to be critical thinkers and problem solvers. Our engineering curriculum has been instrumental in ensuring that the activities are rigorous. Our career day programs bring professionals into the school to expose the students to real-world experiences. Through mentoring programs, our students also learn the process of preparing themselves for higher education.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: SWD ELA Achievement				\$2,900.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0941 - Plantation Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,000.00
			Notes: After School Tutoring			
			0941 - Plantation Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$900.00
			Notes: Vocabulary City Technology			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Achievement Grades 3-5				\$11,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0941 - Plantation Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$8,000.00
			0941 - Plantation Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$3,000.00
			Notes: After School tutoring material			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus:				\$0.00
Total:						\$13,900.00