Winston Academy Of Engineering

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Winston Academy Of Engineering

3415 SWINDELL RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

Demographics

Principal: Lucus Wilkins

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2019

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)	80%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: C (48%)
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 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

Winston Academy Of Engineering

3415 SWINDELL RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

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	67%

School Grades History

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

Our mission is to collaborate and use creative thinking to solve real-world problems, build and achieve dreams, embrace diverse cultures, and cultivate competitive engineers by preparing them for a diverse global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Winston Academy of Engineering will ensure the highest standards of intellectual development through a stimulating and comprehensive STEM program with an emphasis on Engineering. The learning community is actively involved to instill within students the courage to take appropriate risks, and have the confidence to accept challenges. Together we will give rise to students who are resilient and adaptable, equipped with knowledge and a 21st century skill set to achieve their greatest potential in an ever changing, diverse society.

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
Brown, Ava	Principal	
McKenna, Timothy	Assistant Principal	
Cox, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
Stedem-Wyma, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	
Accardo, Michelle	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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

Thursday 7/25/2019

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	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	74%	51%	57%	60%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	51%	58%	50%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	49%	53%	26%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	74%	57%	63%	70%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	56%	62%	59%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	47%	51%	45%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	47%	53%	51%	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 (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 (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)	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	71%	52%	19%	58%	13%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	48%	29%	58%	19%
	2018	72%	48%	24%	56%	16%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
05	2019	73%	47%	26%	56%	17%
	2018	60%	50%	10%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	83%	56%	27%	62%	21%
	2018	74%	56%	18%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	56%	15%	64%	7%
	2018	71%	57%	14%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	68%	51%	17%	60%	8%
	2018	75%	56%	19%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	45%	14%	53%	6%
	2018	60%	51%	9%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	20	47	55	35	67	58					
ELL	62	71		58	46	27	33				
ASN	100			100							
BLK	52	57	50	53	48	41	27				
HSP	75	71	60	73	59	33	67				
WHT	90	71		91	80		78				
FRL	59	63	52	64	61	45	42				

| 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	17	42		33	33						
ELL	52	72	67	64	52	55					
BLK	33	44	43	52	32	24	29				
HSP	66	73	67	76	64	56	56				
WHT	80	67		86	55		81				
FRL	53	61	53	65	49	34	45				
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	20			20							
ELL	47	32	17	53	48	42	25				
BLK	39	46	32	58	53	29	29				
HSP	58	40	13	65	58	50	50				
WHT	79	66		83	60		67				
FRL	47	36	19	62	47	32	44				

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	61
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	490
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
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	50
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	100
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	47
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	61
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	82
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Math Learning Gains for students in the bottom quartile. In addition, students with disabilities in ELA and Math underperformed the other subgroups and African American students underperformed in Math. Although these subgroups are still performed lower than others, when comparing 2018 to 2019, these subgroups did make gains. For example, students with disabilities improved from 17% to 20% in ELA and 33% to 35%. In Math, African Americans improved overall proficiency by 1% and their learning gains increased from 32% in 2018 to 41% in 2019.

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

The greatest decline occurred in the area of fifth grade mathematics which dropped by 7%. When considering subgroups, Hispanic students dropped in mathematics learning gains from 56% to 33%.

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.

Winston Academy out performed the state in all academic categories.

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

The area of greatest improvement occurred in overall proficiency for ELA in third grade. This grade level improved by 16% due to the fact that the students in this cohort have experienced Reading Workshop since Kindergarten. The same group of third graders also increased Math proficiency by 9%. In addition, Math learning gains for students with disabilities increased from 33% to 67%, ELA achievement for African Americans increased from 33% to 52%.

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

EWS data does not exhibit any areas of concern.

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

1. Students with Disabilities in ELA
2. Students with Disabilities in Math
3. African American Students in Math

4. Math Learning Gains for Bottom Quartile
5. Overall Science Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Students with Disabilities
Rationale	Students with disabilties are not performing at the same level of proficiency as other subgroups in both ELA and Math.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We would like students with disabilities to increase their proficiency in ELA from 20% to 25% during the 2019-2020 school year. In Math, we would like this subgroup to increase from 35% to 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Data from classroom formative and summative assessments will be used to create small group interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Using data to drive instruction allows teachers to focus on the greatest areas of need and therefore close the achievement gap for these students at a faster rate.

Action Step	
Description	1. Develop an accountability tool for ESE inclusion staff and teachers responsible for intervention groups 2. Train ESE inclusion teacher,intervention teachers, and instructional paras in using the accountability tool 3. Monitor the completion of the tool to ensure students are being provided with interventions on a regular basis 4. Host Curriculum Planning meetings to plan whole group lessons and interventions using supplemental resources and instructional supplies such as Florida Ready, Brain Pop, and USA Studies Weekly. All Curriculum Planning will be facilitated by the School-Based Reading Coach. 5. Invite students with disabilities to participate in Extended Learning programs.
Person Responsible	Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Math Learning Gains for Lowest Quartile
Rationale	Winston did not perform as well as the state or the district in math learning gains for the bottom quartile. Our percentage of learning gains for the bottom quartile was 40% while the district was 47% and the state was 51%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We would like to see Math Learning Gains for the Bottom Quartile reach 50% during the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Data from classroom formative and summative assessments will be used to create small group interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Using data to drive instruction allows teachers to focus on the greatest areas of need and therefore close the achievement gap for these students at a faster rate.
Action Step	
Description	1. Develop an accountability tool for ESE inclusion staff and teachers responsible for intervention groups 2. Train ESE inclusion teacher, intervention teachers, and instructional paras in using the accountability tool 3. Monitor the completion of the tool to ensure students are being provided with interventions on a regular basis 4. Host Curriculum Planning meetings to plan whole group lessons and interventions using supplemental resources and instructional materials such as Florida Ready, Brain Pop, and USA Studies Weekly. 5. Invite students in the lowest quartile to participate in Extended Learning
Person Responsible	Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

#3	
Title	Science Proficiency
Rationale	As a STEM school our science proficiency should be closer in percentage to our percentage in ELA and Math.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We would like to reach 65% proficiency in Science for the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students need more opportunities to apply their hands-on learning to text-based scenarios.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Application of knowledge requires higher cognition than simply recalling knowledge.
Action Step	
Description	1. Develop an Article of the Week where students must read and apply scientific knowledge to real-world scenarios. 2.Implement Flashback Fridays where students are given an opportunity to review concepts from previously taught grade levels. 3. Analyze data from classroom and quarterly assessments in order to invite students to Extended Learning 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Ava Brown (ava.brown@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).

The other areas of need are embedded in the Areas of Focus. For example, items 1 and 2 on our priorities list both addressed students with disabilities. Items 3 and 4 both addressed mathematics.

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.

Please see attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

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 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 PBIS to teach the social skills that are needed for all students to be successful in school and rewards those students who practice these skills. In addition, we implement a mentoring program that allows all students to meet with their students on a monthly basis to reinforce the social skills that are taught through the PBIS program.

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

Head Start: A Head Start Program is housed on our campus. Resources are provided to the program to assist in the transition of students from pre-K to kindergarten. Parents of Head Start students are invited to participate in parent workshops and activities provided by the school. The office staff also assists the parents of Head Start students in completing the application for admission to our school.

Kindergarten Kick-off: Each year parents and students of incoming Kindergarteners are invited to participate in a Kindergarten Kick-off session where they are invited to the school to learn about curriculum, transportation, dress code, etc. Students are also given an opportunity to participate in hands-on stations while parents are learning about these policies.

Transition to Middle School: Each year, guidance counselors from the nearby middle schools visit Winston to assist graduating fifth graders in making elective selections before beginning sixth grade.

New Student Orientation: As parents are entering Winston at any grade level, they are invited to participate in a New Student Orientation where they learn about curriculum, transportation, dress code, etc.

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.

N/a

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

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.

Head Start - provides resources to assist students in the transition from pre-k to kindergarten.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains for Lowest Quartile**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Science Proficiency**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**