

Broward County Public Schools

Stephen Foster 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	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Stephen Foster Elementary School

3471 SW 22ND ST, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ricardo Grimaldo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (45%) 2014-15: D (39%)
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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Stephen Foster Elementary School

3471 SW 22ND ST, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312

[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	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	86%

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 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.

F-Foundations of Learning
 O-Optimum Growth
 S-Self-Esteem
 T-Tomorrow's Leaders
 E-Effective decision-making skills
 R-Responsible citizenship

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are committed to teach every student to meet their maximum potential.

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
Grimaldo, Ricardo	Principal	Site Leadership, Instructional Leadership, School Decision Making, Engaging Stakeholders, School Budget, Faculty/ Staff Recruitment and Retention, Curriculum and Professional Development
Martin, David	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, Collaborate in School Decision Making, Engaging Stakeholders, Oversee Special Programs, School-wide Positive Behavior Plan, Student Discipline, Bullying Administrator, Field Trip Coordinator.
Brodsky, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	ESE Specialist, RtI/MTSS Team Member
Munter, Gillian	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach, Instructional Facilitator, RtI/MTSS Team Member
Leon, Lena	Other	English Language Learners (ELL) Contact, Response to Intervention (RtI)/ Multi Tiered Support System (MTSS) Coordinator
Futscher, Stephanie	Other	Math Contact, Science Contact, Title I Coordinator
Ortega, Rachel	School Counselor	Counseling, Social Emotional Learning, Homeless Liaison, Substance Abuse Liaison, 504 Liaison, Outside Services Coordinator

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	115	115	117	129	93	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	691
Attendance below 90 percent	27	24	15	21	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	4	0	3	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	60	42	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152

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	2	6	4	53	40	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155

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	22	13	50	40	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

51

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 10/13/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	42%	59%	57%	41%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	60%	58%	50%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	54%	53%	47%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	65%	63%	49%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	66%	62%	55%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	53%	51%	43%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	46%	53%	40%	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	115 (0)	115 (0)	117 (0)	129 (0)	93 (0)	122 (0)	691 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	27 ()	24 ()	15 ()	21 ()	7 ()	11 ()	105 (0)
One or more suspensions	4 ()	0 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	23 (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)	60 (0)	42 (0)	50 (0)	152 (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	32%	60%	-28%	58%	-26%
	2018	32%	59%	-27%	57%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	62%	-21%	58%	-17%
	2018	36%	58%	-22%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	39%	59%	-20%	56%	-17%
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	35%	65%	-30%	62%	-27%
	2018	47%	63%	-16%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	67%	-26%	64%	-23%
	2018	44%	63%	-19%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	52%	64%	-12%	60%	-8%
	2018	53%	62%	-9%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	49%	-8%	53%	-12%
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	11	27	24	26	43	35	15				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL	34	42	23	44	56	33	31				
BLK	29	50	38	37	57	33	32				
HSP	40	46	18	46	57	33	38				
WHT	60	71		62	63		69				
FRL	38	47	24	45	55	34	37				
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	15	33	48	19	39	43	9				
ELL	27	44	54	40	39	36	18				
BLK	19	27	20	34	34	33	23				
HSP	42	61	56	53	56	42	47				
WHT	58	46		62	61		71				
FRL	38	52	48	49	52	39	44				
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	27	35	30	41	30	10				
ELL	21	53	56	37	50	42	11				
BLK	31	35		35	46	36	29				
HSP	35	52	58	50	58	50	34				
WHT	61	59		65	58		62				
FRL	40	50	49	48	53	42	41				

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	358
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	39
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	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
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 Hispanic/ELL in the Lowest 25% in ELA showed the lowest performance last year. A contributing factor was that we had an increase in our ELL student population in this subgroup, including 21% whose DUESS date is less than 2 years.

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

ELA Hispanic Lowest 25% showed the greatest decline from the prior year. One major factor were all of our students who arrived to the country less than 2 years ago, Hispanic, ELL students with little to no language proficiency.

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 Lowest 25th Percentile, there is a 27% difference> A significant number of the Lowest 25th Percentile is comprised of Hispanic/ ELL students. A major factor were all of our students who arrived to the country less than 2 years ago, with little to no language proficiency.

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

ELA learning gains for white students increased 25% and Math learning gains for Black/ African American component increased by 23%. A factor for the improvement in ELA was the evaluation and reorganization of our Tier I curriculum. The same was done in Math, with a reorganization of Tier I Math curriculum and the organization of how and when certain standards were covered.

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

An area of concern on the EWS data is the number of students who scored Level 1 on the State assessment.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25%tile
2. Math Lowest 25%tile
3. SWD Learning Gains ELA and Math
4. Black/African American Students Federal Index
5. English Language Learners Federal Index

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title English Language Learner

Rationale A deliberate focus on increasing the proficiency and learning gains achieved by students who are classified as English Language Learners (ELL). Many of our ELL students comprise our lowest 25th percentile, as their proficiency increases all subgroups will increase.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

By June 2020, ELL students will score at or above 41% FPPI.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Ricardo Grimaldo (rickygrimaldo@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy

We are utilizing small group interventions with a focus on explicit phonics instruction and the acquisition of academic vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

The focus must remain on language acquisition, despite the fact that many student just arrived. Small group interventions will assist with phonics instruction and acquisition of academic. The students will demonstrate increased proficiency and academic language acquisition.

Action Step

Description

We have created sheltered ELL classrooms which, also, include the majority of our Lowest 25th Percentile students. Support staff provide intervention focused on explicit phonics instruction and academic vocabulary. Student growth will be monitored through multiple progress monitoring formats providing timely feedback and informing instruction.

Person Responsible

Gillian Munter (gillian.munter@browardschools.com)

#2	
Title	Students with Disabilities
Rationale	Students with disabilities (SWD) need to increase their proficiency on Florida Standards Assessment (FSA).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, SWD will score at or above 41% FPPI.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ricardo Grimaldo (rickygrimaldo@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	SWD, whose IEPs dictate, will be strategically placed in specific classes which will be supported by ESE teachers for the majority of the day.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Creating classes, in which SWDs with IEPs that dictate that level of support, are strategic placed in a certain class that allow classroom and ESE teachers to provide maximum support. The ESE teacher will be able to spend increased time supporting the students in one place, as opposed, to being spread for less time over several classes.
Action Step	
Description	Review SWD IEPs to determine the level of support necessary. Then, place SWDs in a classroom in which an ESE teacher will be assigned to the students. The ESE teacher will spend the majority of the day in the classroom providing support to the SWD students in class, as opposed to having to split their support over several classes. As a result support will be intensified through increased time of the ESE teacher and the instruction from the classroom teacher.
Person Responsible	Ricardo Grimaldo (rickygrimaldo@browardschools.com)

#3	
Title	Black/ African American
Rationale	Black/ African American students must increase their FSA ELA proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, Black/ African American students will score at or above 41% FPPI.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ricardo Grimaldo (rickygrimaldo@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students are receiving daily, targeted small group instruction, in their specific area(s) of deficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Classroom teacher and/or Support Staff teacher, provide intensive small group interventions that focus on areas of growth for the students. Progress monitoring is kept utilizing several formative assessments, which the results are used to inform further support and instruction.
Action Step	
Description	Our Black/ African American students performing below grade level have been identified and strategically scheduled to receive daily, targeted small group instruction in their specific area of deficiency.. Student progress will be monitored by formative assessments that routinely given to monitor growth and inform further interventions.
Person Responsible	Ricardo Grimaldo (rickygrimaldo@browardschools.com)

#4	
Title	Literacy
Rationale	Students in all subgroups need to improve their proficiency on FSA ELA
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, students in grades 3 thru 5 students will score at or above 41% FPPI in Literacy on the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ricardo Grimaldo (rickygrimaldo@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students are receiving daily, targeted small group instruction, in their specific area(s) of deficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Classroom teacher and/or Support Staff teacher, provide intensive small group interventions that focus on areas of growth for the students. Progress monitoring is kept utilizing several formative assessments, which the results are used to inform further support and instruction.
Action Step	
Description	Baseline assessment data and class work is utilized to identify area(s) of growth for students. Students are organized and scheduled to receive targeted interventions in specific areas delivered in small group settings. Targeted intervention and instruction are provided by classroom teachers and support staff teachers.
Person Responsible	Ricardo Grimaldo (rickygrimaldo@browardschools.com)

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).

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.

We will host Parent meetings and trainings that will provide parents with information and resources to better understand the learning process, Florida state assessment process, and to assist students increase academic proficiency. Student work is displayed through primary and intermediate academic showcases.

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.

Tier I SEL is delivered to all students utilizing the Stanford Harmony SEL curriculum. Counseling services are provided by our School Counselor on a variety of topics conducted in groups or as individuals. Staff mentoring and peer mentoring programs are utilized to provide targeted support for individuals.

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

Parent information meetings, meet and greet opportunities between staff, students, and parents are utilized to acclimate and orient new students in the school. Fifth graders take a day long field trip to the feeder middle school and participate in other vertical orientation opportunities to ease their transition.

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.

Teachers and support staff participate in quarterly Class Reviews and convene as Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST), as needed, to determine appropriate academic, behavioral, and/or social emotional support and align resources for desired academic achievement.

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

Through School Advisory Council (SAC) and School Advisory Forum (SAF), we engage community members in providing resources and guidance in preparing the students to college and career ready. Within the Innovation Zone (School Feeder Pattern), Zone initiatives and events are developed to provide experiences for students increasing their exposure to college and career awareness.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: English Language Learner				\$62,813.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0921 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	Title III		\$57,813.00
			<i>Notes: Funds will be ESOL resource teacher and Language Enrichment Camps (LEC).</i>			
			0921 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	Title III		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Allocation for supplemental instructional materials.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities				\$72,492.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

			0921 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	IDEA		\$67,492.00
			<i>Notes: The IDEA budget will be for unique aids that will</i>			
			0921 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	General Fund		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Fountas and Pinnell instructional materials.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Black/ African American				\$59,404.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0921 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$56,404.00
			<i>Notes: The Title I, Part A funds will pay for Resource Teacher.</i>			
			0921 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Teacher professional development, training, and substitute teachers.</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Literacy				\$57,404.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0921 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	General Fund		\$56,404.00
			<i>Notes: The General Fund will account for the Literacy Coach.</i>			
			0921 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	School Improvement Funds		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Funds were used to purchase project boards and intervention materials.</i>			
Total:						\$252,113.00