Sleepy Hill Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sleepy Hill Elementary School

2285 SLEEPY HILL RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

Demographics

Principal: Gregory Deal

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2019

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (51%) 2014-15: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk 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

Sleepy Hill Elementary School

2285 SLEEPY HILL RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

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	72%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

As Explorers at Sleepy Hill Elementary, we will implement district curriculum to prepare all students to be full participants in the global community of the future. Sleepy Hill Explorers are expected to show respect, have can do attitudes, explore responsibly, and stay safe always.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Sleepy Hill Elementary, students and teachers will be actively engaged in learning, focused on cognitively complex tasks and students being given opportunities to work together to solve problems and take ownership over their learning in a safe and inclusive environment.

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
Deal, Gregory	Principal	
Kulcher, Lyndsy	Assistant Principal	
Norquist, Brenda	Instructional Coach	
VanBibber, Susan	Instructional Coach	
Rudd, Lori	Instructional Coach	
Williams, Nena	Instructional Coach	
Cress, Tammy	Other	
Walton, Melissa	Psychologist	
Kelley, Bobbi	Instructional Media	
Kornbrust, Kathleen	School Counselor	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	123	123	111	111	103	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	672
Attendance below 90 percent	11	17	16	13	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
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	11	27	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	9	4	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
39

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/13/2019

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	32	18	24	29	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	3	6	5	15	16	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	4	3	26	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	43	30	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119

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	3	4	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	32	18	24	29	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	3	6	5	15	16	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	4	3	26	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	43	30	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119

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	3	4	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	46%	51%	57%	46%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	51%	58%	44%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	49%	53%	50%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	57%	63%	67%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	56%	62%	77%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	47%	51%	64%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	47%	53%	66%	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	123 (0)	123 (0)	111 (0)	111 (0)	103 (0)	101 (0)	672 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	11 (32)	17 (18)	16 (24)	13 (29)	10 (22)	12 (24)	79 (149)
One or more suspensions	0 (3)	0 (6)	0 (5)	0 (15)	0 (16)	0 (4)	0 (49)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (8)	0 (4)	0 (3)	0 (26)	0 (2)	0 (10)	0 (53)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (43)	27 (30)	31 (46)	69 (119)

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	43%	52%	-9%	58%	-15%
	2018	40%	51%	-11%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	48%	-3%	58%	-13%
	2018	37%	48%	-11%	56%	-19%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	46%	47%	-1%	56%	-10%
	2018	33%	50%	-17%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	56%	0%	62%	-6%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	56%	-5%	64%	-13%
	2018	63%	57%	6%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	61%	51%	10%	60%	1%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
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	18	38	32	23	40	31	31				
ELL	44	63	79	57	69	58	44				
BLK	31	45	54	42	43	27	28				
HSP	49	67	77	60	68	63	57				
WHT	57	49		61	56	40	56				
FRL	42	52	61	52	61	53	43				

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	23	47	47	40	58	39	29				
ELL	22	38	50	52	65	40	12				
BLK	36	53	47	41	56	50	41				
HSP	35	43	44	59	68	50	29				
MUL	27			82							
WHT	47	48	50	69	81	64	52				
FRL	38	47	51	58	70	56	38				
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	4	44	64	38	71	70					
ELL	37	29	55	63	76	70	46				
BLK	30	53	57	49	75	64	50				
HSP	49	43	62	71	78	64	63				
MUL	60			80							
WHT	52	40	33	72	77	60	76				
FRL	43	46	46	65	74	62	64				

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	60
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	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	63
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	53
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	53
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.

ELA proficiency is the lowest component due to the amount of students reading well below grade level as they enter 3rd grade. However, we did show an 8% increase in ELA proficiency from the previous school year.

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

4th Grade Math showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The contributing factors could be lowered expectations by teachers and change in format of the test.

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.

3rd grade ELA has the greatest gap compared to the state. Students entering 3rd grade were reading well below grade level prior to entering 3rd grade.

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

ELA Bottom 25 Learning Gains showed a 14% increase. The gains were due to a enhanced focus on data, structured iii time, and purposeful small group instruction.

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

Overall achievement for SWD and Black students

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

1. Increase ELA Proficiency
2. Decreasing the achievement gap with our ESSA subgroups below 40% (SWD and Black students)
3. Increase Science Proficiency
4. Increase LG in bottom 25% in ELA and Math
5. Increase LG in ELA and Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Proficiency
Rationale	FSA ELA proficiency at Sleepy Hill Elementary is at 46%, which is 11% behind the state average.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The goal is to increase ELA proficiency to 50% on the Spring 2020 FSA ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Gregory Deal (gregory.deal@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will continue to incorporate the components of LSI such as targets, success criteria, and focusing heavily on academic teaming with fidelity to effectively teach the Florida ELA Standards.
	In schools and districts across the U.S., LSI's Applied Research Center is transforming core instruction and leadership practices, resulting in rapid gains in student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Academic teaming is a daily instructional process where students collaborate, peer coach, and peer teach while engaged in rigorous, standards-based tasks. It goes far beyond the familiar grouping strategies of the past and is backed by neuroscience and other scientific research. Educators in schools nationwide implement academic teaming, empowering their students to take ownership of their own learning and behavior. Academic teaming has the power to improve academic achievement and social emotional learning simultaneously, while also closing gaps between students of differing abilities, preparing students for college and the workplace, and promoting equity and access.

Action Step	
Description	1.Intentionally plan high quality lessons with a focus on target task alignment and academic teaming with instructional coaches. 2. Monitor student data closely to create purposeful small groups for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, including ESSA subgroups (Black and Students with Disabilities) falling below 40%. 3. Reading Coach will be providing reading endorsement classes on campus. 4. Administration will monitor the fidelity and effectiveness of the implemented curriculum. 5. Coaching cycles for teachers needing Tier 2 and 3 support.
Person Responsible	Lyndsy Kulcher (lyndsy.kulcher@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Science Proficiency
Rationale	Science proficiency on the Statewide Science Assessment is 3% behind the state average.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The goal for Science proficiency on the 2020 Statewide Science Assessment is 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Gregory Deal (gregory.deal@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will continue to incorporate the components of LSI such as targets, success criteria, and focusing heavily on academic teaming with fidelity to effectively teach the Florida Science Standards. In schools and districts across the U.S., LSI's Applied Research Center is transforming core instruction and leadership practices, resulting in rapid gains in student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Academic teaming is a daily instructional process where students collaborate, peer coach, and peer teach while engaged in rigorous, standards-based tasks. It goes far beyond the familiar grouping strategies of the past and is backed by neuroscience and other scientific research. Educators in schools nationwide implement academic teaming, empowering their students to take ownership of their own learning and behavior. Academic teaming has the power to improve academic achievement and social emotional learning simultaneously, while also closing gaps between students of differing abilities, preparing students for college and the workplace, and promoting equity and access.

Action Step	
Description	1. Intentionally plan high quality lessons with a focus on target task alignment and academic teaming with instructional coach. 2. Monitor student data closely to create purposeful small groups for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, including ESSA subgroups (Black and Students with Disabilities) falling below 40%. 3. District Quarterly assessment data will be used to adjust instruction throughout the year. 4. Science instruction will be monitored in all grade levels to ensure full implementation of curriculum and standards. 5. Implementing reading and writing tasks aligned to individual science standards.
Person Responsible	Lyndsy Kulcher (lyndsy.kulcher@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).

In addition to increasing proficiency in ELA and Science, we will continue to closely monitor the bottom 25% in ELA and Math to ensure our gains continue to increase overall and in all ESSA subgroups.

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 create a welcoming school climate through positive interactions with families and high visibility of administration. During family involvement events, we will provide families information related to child development and creating supportive learning environments.Effective school-to-home and home-to-school communication is established through avenues such as Class DoJo, Facebook, the school web page, phone calls and conferences, and more. We will work to strengthen families' knowledge and skills to support and extend their children's learning at home and in the community. Through the School Advisory Council and volunteer recruitment, we will engage families in school planning, leadership and meaningful volunteer opportunities.

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.

On site we have a school psychologist and a guidance counselor. In addition, we also have a social worker that specializes in bullying. These individuals, along with the administrative team mentor students throughout the school year. The guidance counselor also works with specific students on social skills and provides counseling with designated students. This year, our guidance counselor provides coaching to the teachers on how to establish and implement the Tier 1 behavior initiatives. The leadership team also monitors and problem solves routines and procedures to ensure we have a safe and orderly learning environment. The district also provides mental health counseling and assistance with behavior analysts as needed.

Students identified as having social-emotional needs are given the opportunity to meet with the guidance counselor individually or in small groups or if applicable can be met through the classroom staff on a one-to-one basis. Severe cases may be handled with a contracted mental health counselor. The IEP also identifies and addresses social emotional goals for all of our students. Our school also utilizes the following resources (not all will apply and please elaborate on applicable resources):
• Champs
• PBIS
• Mentoring Programs
• Action Based Learning

All classrooms are participating in the Sanford Harmony program focusing primarily on Morning Meetings and Buddy Up for Tier 1 social emotional skills. Students who need additional support will referred to the school counselor for Tier 2 or 3 needs. Additionally, students have been identified for a school based mentoring program based on FSA scores and ESSA subgroups.

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

The school counselor from the middle schools meet with fifth grade students and parents each spring. During these meetings, parents and students can ask questions about the educational programs offered at the middle school. Students may register for their courses at this time.

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.

All instruction and resources are designed to support the teaching of the Florida Standards. The district has created learning maps that outline a pathway in which to teach the standards. Collaborative planning in both reading and math is conducted by the instructional coach weekly during which teachers plan using the curriculum maps and instructional resources. All resources must align with the Florida Standards. The leadership team meets weekly to discuss instructional resources, strategies and through a process of collegial inquiry we determine what additional resources may be used, other than what is already provided by the district.
Additional resources can be purchased with Title I funds and are inventoried by the Title I facilitator to ensure resources are properly accounted for throughout the school.
Title II funds will be used to provide a differentiation training to teachers. This PD will be beneficial to teachers since Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction has been identified as a barrier.
Tutoring will be provided for our ESOL students using Title III funds. This tutoring opportunity provides the students an extended school day to work toward mastery of the standards.
ESE services are provided in a variety of settings including, self-contained, resource services, and inclusive services. The least restrictive environment is identified through the IEP process. ESE services are provided primarily by the classroom teachers through differentiation to meet the needs and goals as identified on their IEP. Funds are available for the ESE department if additional resources are needed.

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

At Sleepy Hill Elementary, teachers are encouraged to plan standards based lessons with real life components interwoven into the curriculum. Providing these experiences allows students to make connections of how what they are learning ties into their future educational or career goals.
Sleepy Hill Elementary participates in the WE3 Expo which is in support of the Workforce Education program in the district. Fifth grade students participate in the exposition so they can become aware of the academic programs offered by the district which will prepare them to become college and/or career ready.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Proficiency	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Proficiency	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00