

Polk County Public Schools

Medulla 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 | 17 |

Medulla Elementary School

850 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

Demographics

Principal: Gale Macleod

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2015

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 (60%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (47%) 2014-15: C (45%) |
| 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 | 17 |

Medulla Elementary School

850 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

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 | 94% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 64% |

School Grades History

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

Medulla Elementary provides a safe, rigorous, academic environment. Each child will reach his/her fullest potential and become a respectful and productive citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a part of the Medulla community, Medulla Elementary provides a safe, supportive environment that fosters curiosity, inquiry, and a life-long pursuit of knowledge.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Richardson, Myra | Principal | |
| Aranda, Ginnie | School Counselor | |
| MacLeod, Gale | Assistant Principal | |
| Hill, Cathy | Teacher, ESE | |
| Martin, Victoria | Instructional Coach | |
| LaFay, Julie | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Brown, Sandra | Teacher, K-12 | |
| | Instructional Coach | |

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 | 87 | 80 | 97 | 98 | 119 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 587 |
| 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 | 16 | 22 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |

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 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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

48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

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 | 10 | 18 | 26 | 18 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 13 | 11 | 17 | 7 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 4 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

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 | 4 | 23 | 21 | 35 | 59 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 |

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 | 53% | 51% | 57% | 53% | 51% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 57% | 51% | 58% | 47% | 53% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 67% | 49% | 53% | 31% | 50% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 61% | 57% | 63% | 63% | 58% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 68% | 56% | 62% | 68% | 57% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 58% | 47% | 51% | 57% | 49% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 54% | 47% | 53% | 42% | 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 | 87 (0) | 80 (0) | 97 (0) | 98 (0) | 119 (0) | 106 (0) | 587 (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) | 16 (0) | 22 (0) | 15 (0) | 53 (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 | 51% | 52% | -1% | 58% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 51% | -4% | 57% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 60% | 48% | 12% | 58% | 2% |
| | 2018 | 54% | 48% | 6% | 56% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 47% | 47% | 0% | 56% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 50% | -11% | 55% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -7% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 55% | 56% | -1% | 62% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 54% | 56% | -2% | 62% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 71% | 56% | 15% | 64% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 57% | 2% | 62% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 17% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 56% | 51% | 5% | 60% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 56% | -8% | 61% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 50% | 45% | 5% | 53% | -3% |
| | 2018 | 52% | 51% | 1% | 55% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 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 | 30 | 44 | 53 | 40 | 52 | 56 | 41 | | | | |
| ELL | 41 | 52 | | 61 | 69 | 50 | 40 | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 49 | 80 | 42 | 56 | 62 | 35 | | | | |
| HSP | 53 | 57 | 68 | 63 | 66 | 45 | 55 | | | | |
| MUL | 54 | 64 | | 67 | 71 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 59 | 50 | 67 | 77 | 83 | 62 | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 56 | 69 | 52 | 66 | 50 | 48 | | | | |
| 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 | 21 | 37 | 35 | 28 | 42 | 45 | 34 | | | | |
| ELL | 43 | 59 | 69 | 55 | 45 | | 25 | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 38 | 33 | 41 | 49 | 38 | 35 | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 53 | 70 | 58 | 54 | 29 | 48 | | | | |
| MUL | 61 | 44 | | 57 | 44 | | 60 | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 38 | 20 | 56 | 48 | 50 | 65 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 42 | 40 | 52 | 47 | 37 | 49 | | | | |

| 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 | 17 | 25 | 33 | 28 | 50 | 62 | 17 | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 41 | 35 | 48 | 59 | 56 | 10 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 38 | 25 | 56 | 66 | | 38 | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 45 | 36 | 61 | 66 | 57 | 33 | | | | |
| MUL | 60 | 55 | | 77 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 53 | 30 | 67 | 68 | 50 | 56 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 44 | 30 | 58 | 70 | 63 | 36 | | | | |

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 | 60 |
| 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 | 60 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 478 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 45 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 52 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 59 |
| 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 | 64 |
| 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 | 66 |
| 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.

Fifth Grade ELA

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

No Decline in any components

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.

Fifth Grade ELA by 9 pts. Inability to completely unpack all standards.

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

Fourth grade math. Intentionally unpacking standards and making sure tasks were aligned to the standard.

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

ELA in all areas
Gains in all area

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

1. ELA
2. ELA Lowest quartile
3. ELA Gains
4. Math
5. Math Lowest quartile

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1 | |
|---|---|
| Title | Improve student achievement in ELA by 5% in each grade level |
| Rationale | In grades three and five, our student proficiency in ELA was below the state. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | This year, the goal is to improve the ELA scores, in each grade level by 3% - 7%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Myra Richardson (dr.richardson@att.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | I will ensure that small group instruction is tailored to the needs of the students. We will have afterschool to solidify concepts taught during the school day with a focus on integrating knowledge and craft/structures. We will focus on writing using a "Day 6" model shifting from "Week 6". This combination of instructional changes should provide the academic lift we are working for. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Day 6 - provides frequency of practice and revisions Afterschool Tutorial - Remediation |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Move from week 6 to day 6 2. Invite students to tutorial based on lagging FSA and current star data 3. Visit all classrooms weekly 4. Coach tier 2 & tier 3 teachers to success 5. |
| Person Responsible | Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net) |

| #2 | |
|---|--|
| Title | Gains for students performing in the lowest quartile |
| Rationale | In the area of student achievement, in the lowest quartile, our percentages grew. However, they are not where they need to be. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Growth in the lowest quartile will improve in all areas by 3% - 7%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Myra Richardson (dr.richardson@att.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | We will use "Student pull-outs" to create small groups with similar needs. The interventionist will use data to determine the needs of the students. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Small group instruction |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify lowest quartile 2. identify students with common needs 3. Create schedule for small groups 4. Intervene 5. |
| Person Responsible | Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@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).

Through classroom walkthroughs and campus data monitoring.

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.

See school Parent Involvement Plan submitted online to the LEA September 17, 2013.

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.

All staff members provide for the social-emotional needs of our students. Selected members of the school staff provide additional mentoring for identified students using a check in/check out system. Students are provided access to mental health counseling. A school social worker is also available.

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

Head start and Pre K teachers meet with kindergarten teachers to understand kindergarten standards. Kindergarten Round Up is held each year to familiarize and educate the families of our preschoolers and better prepare them for kindergarten. Screenings are done to assess preschoolers' academic needs and to help parents know how to better prepare their children for elementary school. Summer book check out is also made available to entering kindergarten families.

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

Funds school-wide services to Medulla Elementary. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. Title I, Part A, supports after-school and summer instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III to ensure that staff development needs are addressed accordingly.

Title I, Part C

Migrant students enrolled in Medulla Elementary will be assisted by the school and by the District Migrant Education Program (MEP). Students will be prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status. MEP Teacher Advocates, assigned to schools with high percentages of migrant students, monitor the progress of these high need students and provide or coordinate supplemental academic support. Migrant Home-School Liaisons identify and recruit migrant students and their families for the MEP. They provide support to both students and parents in locating services necessary to ensure the academic success of these students whose education has been interrupted by numerous moves.

Title I, Part D

Provides Transition Facilitators to assist students with transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school. The Transition Facilitators communicate with the Guidance Counselors at schools to facilitate the transfer of records and appropriate placement.

Title II

Professional development resources are available to all schools through Title II funds. In addition, School Technology Services provide technical support, technology training, and licenses for software programs and web-based access via Title II-D funds as made available. Funds available to Medulla Elementary are used to purchase technology and provide professional development.

Title III

Provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, and learning opportunities for school staff.

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

Medulla Elementary advances college and career by ensuring that students are equipped readers and capable of computations upon entering the secondary stage of education.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|--|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Improve student achievement in ELA by 5% in each grade level | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Gains for students performing in the lowest quartile | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |