James W. Sikes Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

James W. Sikes Elementary School

2727 SHEPHERD RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

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

Demographics

Principal: Kerry Chapman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2019

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)	91%
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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (51%) 2014-15: B (59%)
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

James W. Sikes Elementary School

2727 SHEPHERD RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

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

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	77%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

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

The mission of Sikes Elementary, with the support of the home and the community, is to provide the highest quality education for our students by creating a caring and challenging atmosphere that encourages life long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In partnership with home and community, Sikes Elementary is committed to educating productive citizens of tomorrow.

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
Chapman, Kerry	Principal	Kerry Chapman, Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implement and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
Williams, Kirsten	Psychologist	Kirsten Williams, School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical evaluation; assists in facilitation of data-based decision making activities.
Ewing, Dorothy	Assistant Principal	Dorothy Ewing, Assistant Principal: Leads the PBIS team, provides information on school-wide discipline data, ensures that school-based team is implementing MTSS, participates in implementation of intervention support and documentation and ensures adequate professional development to support assessment of MTSS knowledge and skills of staff.
Marcano, Erica	Instructional Coach	Erica Marcano, Math Coach: Supports teachers by modeling instruction, reviewing and analyzing data and leading collaborative planning sessions. She also leads monthly support meetings for teachers new to Sikes.
Joiner, Kaitlin	Instructional Coach	Kaitlin Joiner, ELA Coach: Supports teachers by modeling instruction, reviewing and analyzing data and leading collaborative planning sessions. She also leads monthly support meetings for teachers new to Sikes.
Dodge, Kristin	Other	Kristin Dodge as one of our Reading Interventionists, she supports identified lowest quartile ELA students through small group reading instruction.
Salas, Christina	Other	Christina Salas, as one of our Reading Interventionists, she supports identified lowest quartile ELA students through small group reading instruction.
Shipe, Megan	Teacher, ESE	Megan Shipe, ESE Facilitator: Coordinates and oversees ESE department and monitors compliance issues, participates in student data collection, supports teachers with strategies to use in tiered interventions specific to behaviors; collaborates with general education teachers.
Downer, Amy	School Counselor	Amy Downer, Guidance Counselor: Supports Tier 1 school-wide initiatives; participates in the development and coordination of Tier 2/3 interventions. Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. Communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavior and social success.

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	118	132	124	145	143	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	817
Attendance below 90 percent	0	21	13	10	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	12	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	2	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

43

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	2	21	13	10	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	12	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

Grade Level header spans columns K–12.

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	54%	51%	57%	56%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	51%	58%	59%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	49%	53%	65%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	57%	63%	63%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	56%	62%	69%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	47%	51%	65%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	47%	53%	46%	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	118 (0)	132 (0)	124 (0)	145 (0)	143 (0)	155 (0)	817 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	21 (0)	13 (0)	10 (0)	14 (0)	12 (0)	70 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	5 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)	19 (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)	12 (0)	15 (0)	15 (0)	42 (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	59%	52%	7%	58%	1%
	2018	64%	51%	13%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	48%	3%	58%	-7%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison	1%					
Cohort Comparison	-13%					
05	2019	45%	47%	-2%	56%	-11%
	2018	57%	50%	7%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison	-12%					
Cohort Comparison	-5%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%
	2018	61%	56%	5%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison	4%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	56%	3%	64%	-5%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison	4%					
Cohort Comparison	-2%					
05	2019	56%	51%	5%	60%	-4%
	2018	62%	56%	6%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison	-6%					
Cohort Comparison	1%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	45%	8%	53%	0%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
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	15	29	35	30	37	35	12				
ELL	27	53	50	38	55	56	15				
BLK	43	54		52	36	20	33				
HSP	50	56	54	60	71	62	43				
MUL	61	40		56	67						
WHT	59	50	41	64	56	48	56				
FRL	45	53	56	49	55	50	40				

				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	22	24	33	31	38	30	31				
ELL	37	51	70	44	45	32	40				
BLK	46	39	25	50	55	42	43				
HSP	55	61	59	58	48	33	50				
MUL	85	80		60	50						
WHT	64	58	50	67	59	39	72				
FRL	54	57	57	56	51	40	58				

				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	52	55	23	55	58	21				
ELL	25	42	67	38	71	85	15				
BLK	33	40	44	51	53	36	15				
HSP	48	54	56	58	66	63	43				
WHT	67	66	82	68	73	79	57				
FRL	44	50	57	54	68	60	34				

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	54
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	44
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	57
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	56
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	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	51
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 Learning Gains and Lowest Quartile components were the lowest performing for the 2019-2020 spring assessment. Learning Gains dropped 5 points from 57% to 52%. Lowest Quartile students did not make progress from last year as they remained at only 51% making gains.

Although the Learning Gains for our Lowest Quartile in Math increased significantly by 13%, this component was still one of our lowest performing with only 50% of identified students making gains.

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

ELA scores dropped significantly for the 2018-2019 spring assessments. Proficiency levels declined 6 points to 54%. The second lowest percentage in the past four years.

Our Science data also showed a significant decline from 61% in 2018-2019 to 53% in 2018-2019. We have noticed a trend which the Science data closely correlates to ELA proficiency scores as it is a reading test as well.

Factors that may have contributed to this decline could be do to a fifth grade teacher who was excessively absent due to medical reasons. One fourth grade teacher moved and a new teacher started in November with students. We also had a significant number of students receiving ESE services in grades 3-5. It is a trend that we have been less than successful with reaching these students to make progress.

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.

Our biggest gaps were with 4th and 5th grade ELA. Our fifth grade scores were 11% below the state average of 56%. This cohort of students scored low on the previous year's 4th grade FSA assessment with only 54% being proficient.

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

Our Math Lowest Quartile component made the biggest gain during the 2019-2020 spring assessment. We increased 13% from 37% in 2018 to 50% in 2019.

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

We had 72 students with excessive absences last year (less than 90%. This is a concern for us as well as students who are being checked out early. Another area for concern is the number of retained students in 3rd grade which is 12.

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

1. Effectively meet the needs of our ESE students and African American students as identified by ESSA.
2. Increase ELA proficiency for all students.
3. Increase Learning Gains for students identfied as the lowest quartile in ELA.
4. Decrease the number of office referrals to increase time learning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Academic
Rationale	Our academic focus for the 2019-2020 school year was developed after review of FSA scores from the previous years. Our overall reading proficiency levels declined 6% from the previous year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will increase reading proficiency levels for ESE and African American subgroups on the spring 2020 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) by 5% for each subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will provide additional instructional support for subgroups of students identified by ESSA as under-performing. We will provide additional small group instruction for students identified as the lowest quartile.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our struggling students need additional supports to increase ELA achievement. After reviewing our 2018-2019 FSA data, we noticed trends for our school in regards to ELA performance and how our lowest quartile of students performed. We also noticed that many of our lowest quartile students are students who receive ESE services. Our beginning of the year STAR data also supports these observations. In order to meet the needs of these students, we need to focus on improving small group interventions and providing extra supports throughout the day. We also need to focus on prevention with our primary students to ensure they are coming to 3rd grade reading on grade level.

Action Step

Description	1. Two Reading Interventionists will provide small group support for identified students in the lowest quartile for grades 3-5. 2. We will restructure our ESE Inclusion Teachers and Paraprofessionals schedules to maximize time spent with students. 3. Instructional Coaches will plan with grade level teams weekly and provide coaching support for identified teachers through modeling and feedback. 4. Teachers will be provided two collaborative planning days, with substitutes, to assist with developing quality lesson plans with a focus on: target/task alignment, students engagement and small group instruction. 5. We will provide additional I Pads to promote use in classrooms to assist instruction as well as use in testing. 6. We will provide parents with content focused family nights to provide parents with ideas to use at home to promote learning. 7. We will use timely resources for students to use to support reading instruction (Time for Kids) for grades 3-5. 8. We will provide extended learning tutoring for students in grades 1-3 in the area of reading. 9. Teachers will attend a training for implementing success criteria lead by LSI consultant. 10. Administration and Leadership Team will attend LSI conference in Orlando in June 2020.

Person Responsible	Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Social/Emotional
Rationale	Students must have their emotional needs met so they are able focus on learning. Emotional needs at school include feeling safe and having friends. Many times, students come to school lacking positive social skills to help them make friends and resolve conflicts peacefully. We need to teach social skills and promote a peaceful environment in all classrooms.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will decrease the number of office referrals for all students by 5% from the 2018-2019 data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dorothy Ewing (dorothy.ewing@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	During the 2019-2020 school year, all classroom teachers will implement two strategies from the Sanford Harmony curriculum: Morning Meet Ups and Buddy Up. These strategies teach students how to interact positively with classmates by getting to know them better. They also help students learn empathy towards others when supporting a friend.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on the number of office referrals last year and teacher feedback at the end of the year, we believe that the social/emotional needs of our students were not being met. After reviewing our referral data, we noticed that many issues were due to students not knowing how to interact appropriately when they were upset or students being angry with one another.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will implement the Morning Meet Up practice as well as the Buddy Up system through Sanford Harmony. 2. We will implement new PBIS school wide system of rewards with special emphasis on lunchroom and bus behaviors. 3. Tier 2 interventions for behavior will be lead by our LEA Facilitator. 4. We will implement quarterly student pep-rallys to motivate students, review expectations and celebrate meeting goals.
Person Responsible	Dorothy Ewing (dorothy.ewing@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, § 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.

There are many opportunities for parents to become involved in their child's education at Sikes. In addition to parent-teacher conferences, we encourage parents to become approved volunteers and assist teachers in the classroom or help with a project at home.

We also host different parent involvement opportunities during the school year. These include a before school Orientation, Open House, Science Fair Night, Fall Festival, musical performances and Curriculum Nights. Our Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) actively recruits parents to help with events such as fundraisers and our school wide Fun Day at the end of the year.

Our school will participate in the One School, One Book initiative where as everyone will read the same book druing a specified time frame. Each student and staff member will have their own copy. School wide activities will take place during the reading such as trivia and discussions.

Please see attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for additional 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.

The social-emotional needs of students are a priority at Sikes. 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:

Champs: teachers will use the CHAMPS acronym in classrooms to develop appropriate voice levels and activity level for students.

PBIS: This is our school wide core behavior plan. Students may earn monthly rewards for following the expectations. Bus and lunchroom behaviors are the focus for us this year. We will choose a bus of the month to present of the morning news show as well as provide them treats.

Sanford Harmony: All classroom teachers will implement components of the Sanford Harmony curriculum. The first being, the Morning Meet Up where teachers help build a sense of family and community. The second component is Buddy Up. Students develop a friendship and learn to support one another.

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

The district provides VPK at specific schools throughout our county. At Sikes, we have two ESE PreK classrooms. During the month of April, Kindergarten enrollment begins. Parents and students are invited to a special night when they can visit classrooms, enroll students, ask questions and walk around campus.

Our fifth grade students attend the We3 Expo in November. This expo allows students to see the different opportunities afford them in middle school.

In the spring, math and science teachers from Mulberry Middle School visit Sikes and team teach with our fifth grade teachers. Our fifth grade students also take a field trip to the middle school to tour the campus and attend an information session at night with their parents.

Our ESE Facilitator leads transition meetings for our fifth grade ESE students with the middle school guidance counselors. These meetings are held with parents to discuss the transition of services to 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.

School Leadership Team reviews FSA data during the summer to prepare focus and prioritize needs of the school. Once the needs are clearly identified, the leadership team works to develop strategies and discuss resources needed to meet these needs.

With this information, decisions are made such as changing the paraprofessional structure for classroom support. Identifying a specific para designated to work with one grade level and identified students who are in the lowest quartile. Our lowest quartile students include our targeted ESSA subgroup of ESE students.

Title 1 funding supports the needs of our students through personnel such as as our Instructional Coaches who work directly with teachers to improve instruction. One Reading Interventionist position is funding through Title 1.
This teacher will work directly with identified lowest quartile students on reading skills.

Teachers are provided two curriculum planning days each year where substitutes are provided through Title 1 funds to collaborate with their teams and coaches to prepare units of instructions. Classroom instructional materials and technology are also purchased to use in classrooms directly with students.

Title 1 money is also used to send teachers to professional development such as the LSI conference during the summer. Funds will also be used to pay for a consultant to train teachers K-5 on implementing success criteria in the classrooms as well as use the standards tracker computer software to develop lessons. Funding also provides money for our after school tutoring sessions for struggling students.

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

The Great American Teach In Day is celebrated each November at Sikes Elementary. Parents and Community members visit students and share their careers. We have guests from all lines of work such as a radio personalities and police officers to bakers and the Superintendent of Schools. Students are encouraged to ask questions and research different careers.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Academic	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Social/Emotional	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**