Chain Of Lakes Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chain Of Lakes Elementary School

7001 STATE HIGHWAY 653, Winter Haven, FL 33884

http://schools.polk-fl.net/chainoflakes

Demographics

Principal: Suzie Nelson

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2019

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)	89%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: A (63%) 2014-15: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Polk County School Board on 12/20/2019.

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

Chain Of Lakes Elementary School

7001 STATE HIGHWAY 653, Winter Haven, FL 33884

http://schools.polk-fl.net/chainoflakes

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	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Polk County School Board on 12/20/2019.

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.

We believe each child is unique and has potential. We believe it is our responsibility to instill in each child the ability to think critically, work cooperatively, pursue knowledge, respect others and make responsible healthy choices.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Chain of Lakes Elementary is a family partnership committed to excellence. We expect everyone to cooperatively acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to become successful lifelong learners and productive citizens with respect for themselves, others and the world around them.

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
Duncan, Victor	Principal	
Nelson, Suzie	Assistant Principal	
Ford, Beth	Assistant Principal	
Nottage, Lavieria	School Counselor	
Morse, Marie	Other	
Drehmer, Melissa	Other	
Bilbrey, Danielle	Instructional Coach	
Frost, Laura	School Counselor	
Albritton, Shawn	Instructional Media	
Brock, Jackie	Administrative Support	
Victor, Bruce	Dean	
Wilson, Kristi	Instructional Coach	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	9	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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)

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/20/2019

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	43	33	35	47	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	215
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	58	56	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194

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	

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	43	33	35	47	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	215
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	58	56	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194

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	68%	51%	57%	70%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	51%	58%	74%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	49%	53%	62%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	75%	57%	63%	79%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	56%	62%	84%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	47%	51%	73%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	47%	53%	53%	46%	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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (43)	0 (33)	0 (35)	0 (47)	0 (23)	0 (34)	0 (215)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (2)	0 (2)	0 (1)	0 (8)
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 (58)	0 (56)	0 (80)	0 (194)

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	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	48%	20%	58%	10%
	2018	61%	48%	13%	56%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	59%	47%	12%	56%	3%
	2018	68%	50%	18%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	56%	20%	62%	14%
	2018	72%	56%	16%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	56%	15%	64%	7%
	2018	70%	57%	13%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	74%	51%	23%	60%	14%
	2018	70%	56%	14%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	32	55	55	49	66	59	27				

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	51	73	62	63	55	45	43				
ASN	94	92		100	92						
BLK	67	67	58	66	67	58	39				
HSP	51	68	65	66	65	54	36				
MUL	73			87							
WHT	76	69	66	82	80	70	68				
FRL	62	68	65	71	74	65	46				
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	29	57	60	35	48	34	30				
ELL	55	69	54	65	61	46	46				
ASN	87			93							
BLK	64	59	57	61	54	31	39				
HSP	59	64	61	65	59	43	51				
MUL	53	45		67	55						
WHT	72	66	46	84	75	64	82				
FRL	59	57	58	69	61	45	59				
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	27	44	45	40	62	59	5				
ELL	43	61	58	61	80	76	25				
ASN	82			100							
BLK	55	75	65	67	75	46	27				
HSP	58	63	59	71	87	81	47				
MUL	71			86							
WHT	81	79	65	87	83	67	62				
FRL	60	67	53	71	78	65	38				

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	67
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	535

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
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	95
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
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	60
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	80
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	73
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	66
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.

This year's low performance was primarily due to our students' lack of exposure to analyzing scientific data/information on a deeper level. The standards were taught this year but at a lower taxonomy. The content was not taught to be used for application or analyzing purposes. Our goal this year is to use rigorous materials that require students to analyze scientific data and apply that knowledge. As far as trends, our data do not support a trend. Our science scores continue to fluctuate each year (ie. High, low, high, low).

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

This year's low performance was primarily due to our students' lack of exposure to analyzing scientific data/information on a deeper level. The standards were taught this year but at a lower taxonomy. The content was not taught to be used for application or analyzing purposes. Our goal this year is to use rigorous materials that require students to analyze scientific data and apply that knowledge. As far as trends, our data do not support a trend. Our science scores continue to fluctuate each year (ie. High, low, high, low).

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.

This year's low performance was primarily due to our students' lack of exposure to analyzing scientific data/information on a deeper level. The standards were taught this year but at a lower taxonomy. The content was not taught to be used for application or analyzing purposes. Our goal this year is to use rigorous materials that require students to analyze scientific data and apply that knowledge. As far as trends, our data do not support a trend. Our science scores continue to fluctuate each year (ie. High, low, high, low).

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

The data that showed the most improvement was our ELA and Math learning gains and bottom 25% learning gains. During the 2018-2019 school year, the academic coaches and administration consistently worked with teachers on analyzing progress monitoring data to prepare for small group instruction. Teachers used this data to effectively target the needs of their students with fidelity. Additionally, the ESE inclusion teachers collaborated with general education teachers on how to better meet the needs of our SWD. This collaboration between coaches, administration, and teachers resulted in our 18-19 learning gains.

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

1. Number of Discipline Referrals
2. Absences

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

1. Discipline Referrals
2. Number of Tardies
3. Number of Absences
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	4th and 5th Grade Writing
Rationale	An average of 29% of our 4th and 5th graders are proficient in writing based on an 8/10 on the state 4/5 writing rubric.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the number of proficient 4th and 5th grade writing students from 29% to 33%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Danielle Bilbrey (danielle.bilbrey@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small groups based on progress monitoring data
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Creating small groups based on progress monitoring data was an effective strategy used for students in the bottom 25% last year. Our students in the bottom 25% showed significant gains when this strategy was implemented.

Action Step	
Description	1. Reading coach will provide monthly professional development on writing with student exemplars 2. 4th and 5th grade teachers will collaborate on a universal language and process for writing instruction 3. Administration will request district writing support/professional development for teachers 4. Reading coach/administrators will collect, analyze, and provide feedback on student artifacts 5. Reading coach/administrators will conduct walk-throughs during writing instruction, providing immediate feedback 6. Title I resource teacher and paraprofessional will provide targeted small group writing instruction 7. Teachers will use learning from LSI to engage students in productive struggle through the use of teaming 8. Communicate student academic progress in parent communication notebook, agenda 9. Supplies will be provided to families to engage in activities involving the state standards during family academic nights
Person Responsible	Danielle Bilbrey (danielle.bilbrey@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	SWD ELA Proficiency
Rationale	SWD students demonstrate a large gap in proficiency as compared to regular education students (32.8% versus 68%)

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the number of proficient SWD in ELA to 36%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	ESE teachers use progress monitoring data to determine student learning gaps and collaborate with teachers on how to address them.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	SWD show significant gains when their learning gaps are identified and taught.
Action Step	
Description	1. Strategic scheduling of Inclusion ESE teachers during classroom small group instruction 2. ESE teachers participate in general education teachers planning and professional learning communities 3. Administration will conduct data chats with ESE teachers throughout the school year 4. Provide classroom teachers with professional development on effective techniques to meet the needs of SWD 5. Continue with effective core instruction of grade level standards/ expectations 6. Transition SWD who are in a self-contained classroom to a LRE for core subjects 7. Reading coach/administrators will collect, analyze, and provide feedback on student artifacts 8. Reading coach/administrators will conduct walk-throughs during writing instruction, providing immediate feedback 9. Teachers will use learning from LSI to engage students in productive struggle through the use of teaming 10. Communicate student academic progress in parent communication notebook, agenda 11. Supplies will be provided to families to engage in activities involving the state standards during family academic nights
Person Responsible	Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

#3	
Title	ELL ELA Proficiency
Rationale	ELL students demonstrate a large gap in proficiency as compared to regular education students (32% versus 68%)

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the number of proficient ELL students in ELA to 36%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	ELL and general education teachers use progress monitoring data to determine student learning gaps and collaborate with each other on how to address them.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	ELL students show significant gains when their learning gaps are identified and taught.

Action Step	
Description	1. Strategic scheduling of the ELL teacher and para support during small group instruction 2. Provide effective vocabulary instruction of the content vocabulary used in the regular education classroom 3. Provide teachers with professional development on practical techniques for teaching vocabulary to the ELL student 4. Administrators to conduct data chats with ELL teacher on progress monitoring data and problem-solve to address learning gaps 5. Continue with effective core instruction on grade-level standards/ expectations 6. Reading coach/administrators will collect, analyze, and provide feedback on student artifacts 7. Reading coach/administrators will conduct walk-throughs during writing instruction, providing immediate feedback 8. Teachers will use learning from LSI to engage students in productive struggle through the use of teaming 9. Communicate student academic progress in parent communication notebook, agenda 10. Supplies will be provided to families to engage in activities involving the state standards during family academic nights
Person Responsible	Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

#4	
Title	5th Grade Science
Rationale	50% of our 5th graders are not proficient in science
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the number of students proficient in science from 50% to 62%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. Use science progress monitoring data to determine learning gaps and interventions 2. Collaborate and plan with other schools that had a high number of students proficient in science 3. Provide more labs that require students to analyze more data and charts 4. Use progress monitoring data to ability group students based on content mastery 5. Provide opportunities for vertical teams to discuss the progression of science standards kindergarten through 5th grade 6. Teachers will use learning from LSI to engage students in productive struggle through the use of teaming 7. Communicate student academic progress in parent communication notebook, agenda 8. Supplies will be provided to families to engage in activities involving the state standards during family academic nights
Person Responsible	Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.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).

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.

Chain of Lakes Elementary has a long-standing reputation for excellent relationships with students, their families and the school's community partners. Parents and volunteers are always visible on campus,

actively serving teachers and students. Please see attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for more detailed information.

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.

The social-emotional needs of most students are met through the positive, nurturing, and supportive relationships that teachers develop with their students within the classroom setting. For some concerns, however, students are given the opportunity to meet with the guidance counselor individually or in small groups. Severe cases may be handled through services provided by a contracted mental health counselor. The IEP for students with disabilities may identify and address social-emotional goals for the student. Our school also utilizes school-wide PBIS for consistent school-wide expectations, CHAMPS with Sanford Harmony strategies in the classroom, and DrumBeats or Check-In/Check-Out mentoring for select students.

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

-Our school offers a Kindergarten round-up for entering Kindergarten students as well as Orientation and Open House, which both serve as an opportunity for teachers to share their expectations for the school year with students and their families.
-Our guidance counselor provides tours for interested parents prior to enrollment.
-Our teachers review classroom and school-wide expectations at the beginning of each year which helps new students transition into our school community
-Articulation meetings are held at the end of the school year for Students with Disabilities and Gifted Students. A representative from the middle school where the student will scheduled to attend is invited to participate. The representative will share the services offered at his or her respective school, and then the team will determine the services needed by the student based on various performance data.
-Middle school guidance counselors are invited to speak to groups of 5th-grade students attending the various sites for 6th grade. Students are given the opportunity to tour the schools as well.
-Middle School Night is an event designed to bring middle schools from the surrounding area to Chain of Lakes to highlight their schools and share the opportunities/specialized curriculum available at their school sites that may be of interest to our students and their families to supplement the District WE3 expo in November.

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.

School leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (personnel, instructional, curricular) by district personnel allocations, FTE funds, and various federal funds allocated by the District. Additional resources are provided by parent/teacher organization based on the needs to improve student achievement school-wide.
-IDEA funding through ESE: counselors, school psychologist, and SLP meets monthly to discuss and analyze students being monitored for staffing or additional support needed by classroom teacher
-Title I, Part A project funds are used to provide academic support through coaching teachers and providing interventions for at risk students.
-Title I, Part C project funds assist students who are prioritized by the Migrant Education Program for

supplemental services based on need and migrant status as defined by federal and state regulations.
-Title II funds are used by the District to support our teachers through professional development, recruiting and retaining teachers, and providing support for obtaining and maintaining appropriated teacher certification.
-Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners(ELL) and their teachers, including professional learning for teachers and family engagement opportunities. The ELL TRST meets with school based ELL teachers monthly to view data and discuss the needs of students and teachers.
-Title IX HEARTH: school counselors, office staff, and teachers work collaboratively to identify students identified as being in a homeless situation and providing appropriate services.

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

Chain of Lakes Elementary has deep ties to the community in which it resides. This community includes many retired professionals that are willing to come and mentor our students. Our school participates annually in the Great American Teach-In initiative to help bring awareness to professional jobs within the students' community. Our school also participates in Post Secondary Education Week where students are exposed to various avenues to pursue education after high school graduation.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: 4th and 5th Grade Writing**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: SWD ELA Proficiency**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: ELL ELA Proficiency**	$0.00
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: 5th Grade Science**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**