

Polk County Public Schools

Elbert 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 | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 16 |

Elbert Elementary School

205 15TH ST NE, Winter Haven, FL 33881

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

Demographics

Principal: Alexandra Wise

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) | 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 (50%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (43%) 2014-15: C (45%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | YEAR 1 |
| Support Tier | IMPLEMENTING |

| 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 16 |

Elbert Elementary School

205 15TH ST NE, Winter Haven, FL 33881

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

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 | 71% |

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 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.

The mission of Elbert Elementary School is to ensure all students reach their highest academic potential through a consistent, pervasive, and rigorous curriculum that meets the needs of diverse learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Elbert Elementary School is to provide a school culture that includes a challenging curriculum that meets diverse learning styles in a safe and nurturing environment which will enable all students to become productive citizens of the twenty-first century.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Dawson, William | Principal | |
| Persaud, Kimberly | Assistant Principal | |
| Smith, Pam | Instructional Media | |
| Sheffield, Kristan | Instructional Coach | |
| Bishop, Katie | Instructional Coach | |
| Moyer, Autumn | School Counselor | |

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 | 120 | 99 | 116 | 145 | 117 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 731 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 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 | 23 | 16 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| | 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 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| 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)

39

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 | 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 | 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 | 52% | 51% | 57% | 51% | 51% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 54% | 51% | 58% | 51% | 53% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | 49% | 53% | 49% | 50% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 52% | 57% | 63% | 56% | 58% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 57% | 56% | 62% | 67% | 57% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 37% | 47% | 51% | 54% | 49% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 47% | 47% | 53% | 45% | 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 | 120 (0) | 99 (0) | 116 (0) | 145 (0) | 117 (0) | 134 (0) | 731 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (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) | 23 (0) | 16 (0) | 26 (0) | 65 (0) |
| | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 45% | 52% | -7% | 58% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 51% | -1% | 57% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 51% | 48% | 3% | 58% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 49% | 48% | 1% | 56% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 47% | 47% | 0% | 56% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 50% | -10% | 55% | -15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 28% | 56% | -28% | 62% | -34% |
| | 2018 | 57% | 56% | 1% | 62% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -29% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 64% | 56% | 8% | 64% | 0% |
| | 2018 | 61% | 57% | 4% | 62% | -1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 57% | 51% | 6% | 60% | -3% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 56% | -8% | 61% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 43% | 45% | -2% | 53% | -10% |
| | 2018 | 27% | 51% | -24% | 55% | -28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| 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 | 29 | 46 | 31 | 27 | 47 | 25 | 28 | | | | |
| ELL | 48 | 45 | 45 | 48 | 55 | 31 | 45 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 51 | 50 | 37 | 47 | 20 | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 56 | 53 | 55 | 64 | 58 | 43 | 56 | | | | |
| MUL | 33 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | 62 | 40 | 60 | 70 | 67 | 63 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 50 | 47 | 48 | 54 | 35 | 39 | | | | |
| 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 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 33 | 39 | 29 | 25 | | | | |
| ELL | 48 | 48 | | 61 | 64 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 45 | 39 | 44 | 50 | 38 | 15 | | | | |
| HSP | 64 | 48 | | 74 | 57 | | 42 | | | | |
| MUL | 25 | 25 | | 50 | 67 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | 65 | | 67 | 67 | | 48 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 46 | 40 | 55 | 53 | 40 | 27 | | | | |

| 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 | 19 | 36 | 38 | 29 | 39 | 21 | 22 | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 55 | | 44 | 68 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 36 | 42 | 45 | 60 | 50 | 33 | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 57 | 55 | 56 | 67 | 62 | 36 | | | | |
| MUL | 77 | | | 69 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | 65 | 55 | 64 | 68 | | 70 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 45 | 45 | 53 | 69 | 55 | 37 | | | | |

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 | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 74 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 423 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 35 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 40 |
| 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 | 58 |
| 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 | 42 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 62 |
| 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 | 49 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Third Grade Mathematics. Transitioning back to a Paper-Based Assessment and the unique answer formats proved to be a challenge for our third grade students. Elbert also experienced a large influx of students from other local schools.

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

Third grade mathematics went from 57% proficiency to a 28% proficiency. Students did not master the appropriate standards or the format for the 1819 FSA Assessment.

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.

Third grade mathematics. Lessons were not tailored to the depth of the standard. Thus, leaving students lacking in appropriate standards mastery.

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

5th grade Science. Departmentalization, Stream Line Schedule, Extra support from District Science Coaches and faithful completion of District Quarterly Assessments.

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

Attendance and Discipline

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

1. Third Grade Math
2. Third Grade ELA
3. Lowest 25% in 4th Grade Math
4. Discipline
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | |
|---|---|
| #1 | |
| Title | 3rd Grade Mathematics |
| Rationale | This was identified through our 1819 FSA Data Analysis. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | On our Spring STAR Assessment, Elbert's Target is to be at or above District proficiency levels in the area of Third grade math. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | William Dawson (william.dawson@polk-fl.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Marzano Strategies and Learning Sciences International (LSI) |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | This is the District based initiative that has been tied to students achievement . We have seen how these strategies have impacted our Fourth and Fifth grade classrooms therefore expectations are that Third grade will be successful as well. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Departmentalize 2. Target low performing students 3. Collaboratively plan appropriate tasks to meet the target 4. District support and Coaching 5. Immediate feedback for student and teachers on relevant student data 6.Hired Paraprofessionals to elp tutor the bottom 25% in Math. 7. Purchase BBY materials with Staff Development and Brainpop to supplement instruction 8. Elbert will host a Math night to increase Parent Involvement. |
| Person Responsible | William Dawson (william.dawson@polk-fl.net) |

| #2 | |
|---|--|
| Title | K- 5th Reading |
| Rationale | While FSA scores indicated that our ELA scores were sufficient to achieve a grade of a "C", it is still an area with room for growth. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Our goals for the 2019 2020 school year is to achieve a school letter grade of a "B" and to be at or above District proficiency levels in the area of 3rd, 4th, and 5th ELA. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | William Dawson (william.dawson@polk-fl.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Marzano Strategies and Learning Sciences International (LSI). |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | This is the District based initiative that has been tied to students achievement . We have seen how these strategies have impacted our Fourth and Fifth grade Math classrooms therefore expectations are that Third, Fourth and Fifth grade ELA classrooms will be successful as well. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Departmentalization in grade 3rd- 5th 2. Target low performing students 3. Collaboratively plan appropriate tasks to meet the target 4. District support and Coaching 5. Immediate feedback for student and teachers on relevant student data 6.Hired Paraprofessionals to help tutor the bottom 25% in ELA. 7. Purchase Scholastic News, Storyworks, Time for Kids and new Library Books to supplement instruction. 8. Elbert will host a ELA night to increase Parent Involvement. 9. Teachers will provided weekly assessments in advance to further tailor instruction. |
| Person Responsible | William Dawson (william.dawson@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.

Attached is Elbert's PFEP which outlines how we plan to build positive relationships with all stakeholder in our school community.

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.

Students identified as having social-emotional needs are given the opportunity to meet with the guidance counselor individually or in small groups. Severe cases may be handled with a contracted mental health counselor. The IEP process also identifies and addresses social emotional goals for all of our students. Our school also utilizes the following resources: CHAMPS, PBIS, Mindful Schools and Mentoring Programs.

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

Elbert has a process of communicating with schools of incoming and out going students through their Cumulative folders. We also provide the following for our students: Kindergarten Round Up, Pre-K, and 5th Grade visiting local middle school and the WE3 Expo.

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: 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 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 developments, 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.

Elbert Elementary promotes College and Career Awareness by promoting the following:

- 1- Great American Teach In
- 2- Junior Achievement

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---|--------|---------------------------------------|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: 3rd Grade Mathematics | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: K- 5th Reading | \$0.00 |

| | |
|--------|--------|
| Total: | \$0.00 |
|--------|--------|