

Polk County Public Schools

Lake Shipp 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

Lake Shipp Elementary School

250 CAMELLIA DR, Winter Haven, FL 33880

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/lakeshippelementary>

Demographics

Principal: Kathy Raub

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2019

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 Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (48%) 2014-15: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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

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

Lake Shipp Elementary School

250 CAMELLIA DR, Winter Haven, FL 33880

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/lakeshippelementary>

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	70%

School Grades History

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

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.

At Lake Shipp Elementary, we will foster a learning environment that helps students understand the purpose of learning while actively engaged in student centered activities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:

At Lake Shipp Elementary students are educated through a collaborative team consisting of parents, school staff, peers, and the community to become lifelong learners. Children take risks and become productive and innovative without fear of failure; their gifts and talents are recognized and celebrated.

MOTTO:

Be Responsible
Be Respectful
Be Safe

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
Raub, Kathryn	Principal	
Irace, Karen	Assistant Principal	
Murphy, Jane	Instructional Coach	
Crutchfield, Allison	Instructional Technology	
Gossman, Sara	Instructional Media	
Spencer, Sharonda	Instructional Coach	
Moriarty, Alyssa	Teacher, K-12	

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	78	89	82	92	70	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	485
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	8	4	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
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	34	30	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	3	13	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	1	3	0	23	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

26

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/25/2019

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	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	

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	17	31	31	34	25	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171
One or more suspensions	4	12	29	26	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
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	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	2	3	5	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	49%	51%	57%	49%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	51%	58%	56%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	49%	53%	57%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	57%	63%	45%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	56%	62%	39%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	47%	51%	33%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	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	78 (0)	89 (0)	82 (0)	92 (0)	70 (0)	74 (0)	485 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 (0)	5 (0)	8 (0)	4 (0)	8 (0)	8 (0)	39 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (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 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	34 (0)	30 (0)	27 (0)	91 (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	48%	52%	-4%	58%	-10%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
	2018	41%	48%	-7%	56%	-15%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	47%	47%	0%	56%	-9%
	2018	39%	50%	-11%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	56%	2%	62%	-4%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	56%	-9%	64%	-17%
	2018	37%	57%	-20%	62%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	48%	51%	-3%	60%	-12%
	2018	58%	56%	2%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	45%	-5%	53%	-13%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
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	26	47	45	26	67	70					
ELL	26	36		47	46						
BLK	44	57	40	42	65	75	40				
HSP	39	41	45	55	58		41				
MUL	40			40							
WHT	62	54		62	49		45				
FRL	49	51	50	50	56	65	44				

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	9	26		9	32	33					
ELL	28	70	81	38	61	70					
BLK	31	40	45	41	47	38	45				
HSP	43	56	76	51	55	67	50				
WHT	40	40		51	57		63				
FRL	36	45	58	43	50	48	48				
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	33	38		24	36						
ELL	14	59	80	34	47	50					
BLK	40	56	50	39	37	32	31				
HSP	52	56		46	50		67				
WHT	53	50		52	32		68				
FRL	46	56	54	42	41	32	49				

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	53
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	52
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	47
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	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	54
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	52
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.

In 2018-2019 fifth grade science performed the lowest with 40% of students proficient. This seems to be a trend throughout the state with a decline in science. A contributing factor to our decline in science performance was that the science teacher for 5th grade was out a month before testing due to medical issues.

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

In addition to the drop in proficiency from 50% to 40% in science that is listed above, we also dropped from 58% to 48% proficiency in 5th grade math. We are unsure as to the factor that contributed to this decline.

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.

Fourth grade math had the biggest gap when compared to the state average. Proficiency of fourth grade at Lake Shipp Elementary was 47% in 2018-2019 and the state average was 60% proficiency.

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

Our third and fourth grade math proficiency increased 10% from the previous year. Third grade moved from 48% proficiency to 58% and fourth grade increased from 37% proficiency to 47%. During the 2018-2019 school year we focused on rigorous math instruction, followed the District pacing guides, and monitored student progress with fidelity. Several supplemental programs were used in the classroom to individualize instruction to meet the needs of each student.

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

The performance of our ELA lowest 25% students and the performance of the students with disabilities.

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

1. Attendance.
2. ELA learning gains for our lowest 25%
3. Rigorous instruction in all areas

4. Small group instruction

5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	All staff members at Lake Shipp Elementary will work to build positive relationships with students, families, and community members in order to increase student achievement, student attendance, and reduce discipline referrals.
Rationale	Having a positive school environment continues to be an area to improve on. Discipline issues on the campus contributed to low student attendance and a decrease in student achievement. Time was taken from classroom instruction and redirected to discipline issues with students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To decrease discipline referrals by ten percent (329 to 296) and to increase the percentage of students in attendance 90% of the time or more from 86% to 90%. This will increase the time students receive standards based instruction in the classroom.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Karen Irace (karen.irace@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	CASEL SElect Program - Sanford Harmony Kit PBiS MTSS
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Sanford Harmony provides educators with the tools to foster social connections among all students, and to support the social, emotional, and cognitive skills students need to successfully negotiate peer interactions, develop positive peer relationships, and thrive in school. PBiS sees to improve school climate, reduce discipline issues and support academic achievement. MTSS is a framework that we use to provide targeted support to struggling students, the goal is to intervene early so students can catch up with their peers.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train all staff members on the school wide discipline plan. 2. Review the PBiS framework and continue to assist with implementation throughout the school year. 3. Deliver social skills (Harmony) lessons to all students and revisit areas students struggle with monthly by grade level. 4. Discuss ways to assist students that are having difficulty during the PBiS monthly meetings. 5. Recognize the classroom in each grade level with the highest percentage of attendance monthly and individual students with perfect attendance quarterly. 6. Host three parent nights on campus to build capacity with parents and community members. We will have a literacy night, math night, and science night (Orlando Science Center is on campus). Hands on activities will be planned and sessions on how to help their child be successful at school.
Person Responsible	Karen Irace (karen.irace@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Through administrative and coach support, teachers will plan instruction to increase ELA and math proficiency for all students.
Rationale	On the progress monitoring and the ESSA report, ELA and math continue to be areas of opportunity.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The proficiency overall for ELA was 49% and the ELL and ESE subgroup were 26%. The goal is to move from 49% to 55% for the overall proficiency and from 26% to 30% proficiency for the ELL and ESE subgroups. The overall math proficiency was 53% and the ELL subgroup was 28% and the ESE subgroup was 9%. The goal is to move from 53% to 58% for the overall proficiency and from 28% to 33% for the ELL subgroups and from 9% to 15% for the ESE subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated Instruction Collaborative Planning Small Group Instruction Professional Development
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These additional strategies drive a teacher's instruction as they work to meet specific learning objectives and ensure that their students are equipped with the tools they need to be successful.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on differentiated instruction during collaborative planning with instructional coaches. The Reading Wonders weekly assessment data will be used to create the instruction in small groups during planning. 2. Provide PD on planning for small group instruction and what it looks like. Additional instructional materials are purchased to use in small group as well as using Ready Florida materials. 3. Additional small group instruction for the lowest 25% of our students in ELA with the reading interventionist and Title One para. 4. Insure that inclusion teachers are using researched based strategies during push ins 5. Insure that the ELL paras are using research based strategies during push ins 6. Utilize Ipads in the classroom to provide extra practice on supplemental sites in reading and math. 7. BBY math resources are used during math intervention to learn and review number literacy, multiplication facts, geometry and time.
Person Responsible	Alyssa Moriarty (alyssa.moriarty@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.

The school has student agendas that are used to communicate with parents on a daily basis as well as a weekly parent communication folder. The folder will be sent home every Wednesday with important information for parents as well as weekly student work. A monthly newsletter will be sent home at the beginning of each month with information about upcoming events as well as activities taking place on campus. Class Dojo is used in all classrooms to communicate with parents, instantly share messages, updates and photos from their class. It is the easiest way to share how children are doing at school and to get in touch with teachers. Four nights are planned to invite parents on campus. Our annual Open House will be in the fall to allow parents to come talk with teachers and visit their child's classroom and school environment. Three other nights are planned; reading, math, and science, to showcase what is covered in these areas and to share ways for parents to help their child at home.

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.

Our administration, leadership team and teachers have reviewed previous year's data and discussed retained, ESE, ELL, and students with discipline issues. Early detection regarding students' with needs will be addressed for academic or behavioral support. The MTSS Team will include: School Psychologist, Guidance Counselor, and Reading and Math Coach. They will work cohesively to enhance student learning and behavior. Our school also utilizes the following resources: Champs, PBiS, DrumBeat, Mentoring Programs

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

Orientation is held for all students and kindergarten roundup is held for incoming kindergarten students. During the first 30 days of school our kindergarten students are assessed on the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Skills. This test is used to measure a child's readiness for school. Collaboration between schools prepare students for the next level of education (middle school). At the end of the year, administrators from transitioning middle schools visit and hold assemblies with students to share academic programs and expectations. The third, fourth and fifth grades are departmentalized, which helps children become familiar with transitioning from one class to another. Thus, preparing them for middle school.

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.

- Title I, Part A project funds school-wide services at our eligible and participating Title I schools. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions so that all students achieve academic success.
- Title I, Part C project funds assist students that are prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status, as defined by federal and state regulations.
- Title I, Part D project funds provide Transition Facilitators at select Neglected and Delinquent school sites to assist students who transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school.
- Title II funds provide professional development resources to build the capacity of teachers by funding consultants, district professional development personnel, including district/regional coaches, and curriculum specialists. The Title II project contributes to the recruitment/retention of teachers in the district by funding district recruitment personnel, recruitment initiatives both within and outside the school district. Also, may reimburse certification exam fees for teachers placed in an area in which they do not yet have certification in upon successful passing of exam.
- Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, professional learning opportunities for school staff, as well as parent family engagement opportunities.
- Title IX – Homeless OR HEARTH Program funded through Title IX and Title I, provides support for students identified as being in a homeless situation. Title I provides support for this program, through funding of HEARTH staff, professional development, and contracted extended learning services for students.

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

Our children participate in the Great American Teach-In and are introduced to many job opportunities. Students are given a chance to ask questions regarding various fields of employment. During the year we have a College and Career week, colleges are highlighted and careers are discussed with students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: All staff members at Lake Shipp Elementary will work to build positive relationships with students, families, and community members in order to increase student achievement, student attendance, and reduce discipline referrals.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Through administrative and coach support, teachers will plan instruction to increase ELA and math proficiency or all students.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00