

Polk County Public Schools

# R. Clem Churchwell Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

# R. Clem Churchwell Elementary School

8201 PARK BYRD RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Jacqueline Agard**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: C (49%) 2014-15: D (40%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

# R. Clem Churchwell Elementary School

8201 PARK BYRD RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>87%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>50%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	B	A	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.

At Churchwell Elementary School, we the students, parents, staff, and community will work as a team in a positive environment and experience success each day through meaningful activities using all available resources.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Churchwell Elementary, our school and community, envisions a curriculum delivered through effective teaching practices to prepare our students for the twenty-first century and its work force. Teachers here are committed to professional development. The curriculum will be integrated and will provide the students the opportunity to work with real world experiences which will enhance learning. Emphasis will be placed on concepts and applications of mathematics to help our students communicate mathematically, and apply mathematical skills to real life. We will assess kindergarten through fifth grade students through skill grouping. We will utilize our social skills instruction, peer mediation and conflict resolution to encourage the acceptance of self and others. Through the integration of technology into the curriculum, teacher and student will access information and apply it to their learning experience.

### 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
Agard, Jacqueline	Principal	
Kalch, Laura	School Counselor	
McClellan, Kathy	Instructional Coach	
Friedt, Maria	Instructional Coach	
Skiles, Carlene	Teacher, K-12	
Gilmore, Milton	Teacher, K-12	
Alexander, Reyna	Teacher, K-12	
Hardee, Taryn	Assistant Principal	
Ritter, Daniel	Teacher, ESE	
Mullens, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
Clark, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Jimmerson, Amber	Teacher, K-12	
Kennedy, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Oestreich, Page	Teacher, ESE	
Laughon, Lindsey	Teacher, K-12	
Walls, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	

### 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	121	131	109	124	118	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	706
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	12	9	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	10	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

**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		1	0	0	10	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	9	8	3	11	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

40

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 8/30/2019

**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	25	23	14	14	21	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	1	5	2	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	18	23	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

**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	3	1	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

**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	25	23	14	14	21	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	1	5	2	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	18	23	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

**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	3	1	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

**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%	57%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	51%	58%	53%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	49%	53%	55%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	57%	63%	71%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	56%	62%	74%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	47%	51%	63%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	47%	53%	63%	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	121 (0)	131 (0)	109 (0)	124 (0)	118 (0)	103 (0)	706 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	13 (25)	9 (23)	12 (14)	9 (14)	9 (21)	11 (14)	63 (111)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	0 (5)	0 (2)	4 (3)	0 (4)	0 (7)	4 (22)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (7)	0 (18)	0 (23)	0 (7)	0 (3)	0 (58)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (4)	19 (5)	19 (10)	48 (19)

**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	55%	52%	3%	58%	-3%
	2018	73%	51%	22%	57%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	48%	4%	58%	-6%
	2018	61%	48%	13%	56%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
05	2019	44%	47%	-3%	56%	-12%
	2018	51%	50%	1%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%
	2018	80%	56%	24%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	56%	20%	64%	12%
	2018	76%	57%	19%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	62%	51%	11%	60%	2%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	47%	45%	2%	53%	-6%
	2018	56%	51%	5%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	27	33		47	54		54				

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
ELL	36	44	33	62	71	73					
BLK	42	42		67	64	45	41				
HSP	47	50	53	70	67	68	43				
WHT	60	47	32	76	60	27	66				
FRL	48	39	39	68	60	47	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	49	32		71	55		64				
ELL	38	50	54	66	39						
BLK	46	43	53	62	52	40	43				
HSP	62	57	53	73	63	50	55				
WHT	71	51	39	86	75	56	69				
FRL	56	46	42	73	66	59	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	77	91	85	84	95	92					
ELL	42	41	50	55	64		50				
BLK	42	45	55	60	62	50	43				
HSP	52	50	53	67	69	60	55				
WHT	67	57	53	76	81	78	73				
FRL	50	46	49	65	67	55	57				

**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	57
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

**Subgroup Data**

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

**Analysis**

**Data Reflection**

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

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

The data component showing the lowest performance was Fifth grade ELA. Some contributing factors were consistent standard based instruction and bottom quartile students..

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

Third grade ELA showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The possible factors contributing to these scores were low testing stamina and rigor.

**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.**

Learning gains in ELA showed that we were 10% below the state. Factors contributing to this gap include not providing enough small group/push in instruction to students in the bottom quartile group in addition to not enriching students who were/are high performers.

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

The data that reflected the most improvement was with Accelerated Reader. Students tripled the number of books read for the year and increased the number of minutes spent reading. We placed Media on the rotation block, held AR reward celebrations, kept scoreboards of students performance and shared data weekly in staff's newsletter.

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

Areas of concern in reviewing our EWS data is the proficiency level of students in ELA across all grade levels and the drop in proficiency of most subgroups.

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

1. Increase literacy skills in K-2
2. Provide more small group assistance in grades k -2.
3. Provide PD targeting bottom quartile students, ELL & SWD performance in Math & ELA, grades 3 through 5.
4. Increase proficiency and learning gains in tested grade levels
5. Decrease number of office discipline referrals

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1**

<b>Title</b>	Increase proficiency of bottom quartile students in grades 3 - 5
<b>Rationale</b>	The number of proficient students on the Florida State Assessment declined for these specific grade levels.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** In third grade increase proficiency from 52 to 60%, fourth grade

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome** Jacqueline Agard (jacqueline.agard@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy** Implement teaming throughout the campus.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** This instructional practice will give students ownership of their own learning. Students who are hands on and able to use & implement strategies and information learned develop deeper understanding of subject.

**Action Step**

**Description**

1. Purchased LSI training on teaming activities for teachers using Title I funds
2. Title I coaches will provide support activities and follow up trainings
3. Hold PLCs that target student performance, work samples.
4. Title I paraprofessionals will work with classroom teachers to provide small group instruction to BQ students.
5. Set up model classrooms for teachers to visit.

**Person Responsible** Maria Friedt (maria.friedt@polk-fl.net)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Increase proficiency for ELL students in ELA grades K - 5
<b>Rationale</b>	Increasing proficiency in English Language Learners will improve/strengthen academic foundations.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	An increase of ELL student proficiency on Star/Star Early Lit for primary grades and two percentage points increase on FSA for grades 3 - 5.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jacqueline Agard (jacqueline.agard@polk-fl.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Provide more in class and home reading opportunities. Remediation practices will also focus on fluency and phonemic awareness.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Phonemic awareness and fluency are building blocks to reading and comprehension. In reviewing the data from 2016 struggling readers participated in small group instruction that focused on reading basics. Students in that group showed increase in proficiency.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Primary &amp; Intermediate Title I coaches will provide training for use of great leaps.</li> <li>2. Teachers will have push in targeting reading deficiencies.</li> <li>3. Title I paras will pull small groups.</li> <li>4. ELL paraprofessionals will push into the classrooms</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Taryn Hardee (taryn.hardee@polk-fl.net)
<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Increase literacy in grades K - 2
<b>Rationale</b>	The percent of students being proficient and moving from Star Early Lit to Star has been less than 50 percent.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase the reading minutes from 21 to 30. Have 75 percent of grades K - 2 move into Star by the second administration.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Carlene Skiles (carlene.skiles@polk-fl.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teaching reading foundation (fluency and phonemic awareness)
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Focus on the basics of reading will develop the strong foundation students need to be successful with any task that will require comprehension and synthesis from a student.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Title I para for primary will push in and help with sight words.</li> <li>2. Incentives will be provided for students meeting and surpassing goals.</li> <li>3. Media specialist will be part of specials rotation.</li> <li>4. Title I coaches will provide literacy training to new staff</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]



**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).**

Increasing reading across the content area will require we keep media as part of specials and provide incentives and opportunities for students to continue reading. Decreasing discipline will require daily usage of Stanford Harmony, Drumming and quarterly behavior assemblies were data is reviewed with students. Students enjoy the PBIS monthly incentives and it has maintained students focused.

**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.**

Churchwell maintains an open door policy to build positive relationship with students, parents, families and other community stakeholders. Volunteering opportunities are encouraged through our car loop and Remind messages. Teachers stand at car loop and disseminate information to parents for engagement nights, fundraising activities and volunteering in the cafeteria. Florida Assessment Boot camps and after school tutoring is also offered and parents invited to see how they can better assist their student at home. Elementary grade level parents have specific nights they will visit with teacher. At these meeting families can ask questions and will receive resources to help them assist students at home as well. 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 certified school counselor individually or in small groups or if applicable can be met through the classroom staff one on 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, PBIS, Mentoring program, Drum Beats

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

Churchwell hosts Kindergarten Round up where incoming students are introduced to staff and receive a Churchwell resource bag to take home and use during the summer. Pre - K families attend Academic nights where they receive resources to work at home with their students. This also gives the family an opportunity to interact with other grade levels where students participate in activities geared towards the specific academic night attended.



During the school year our 5th graders participate in Polk County's Expo where primary through secondary schools display all programs hosted at their site. Students are given the opportunity to meet guidance counselors and/or administration from the school they will be attending. They have the opportunity to attend a family night at their middle school and have the opportunity to register for classes prior to starting their 6th grade year.

**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 1, Part A- The Title 1 funds provide supplemental instructional resource and interventions so that all students achieve academic success.

Title IX- Homeless or HEARTH program funded through Title IX and Title 1, provides support for students identified as being in a homeless situation. Title 1 provides support for this program, through funding of HEARTH staff, professional development, 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.**

Churchwell provides exposure to various careers through participation in a Career Day, The Great American Teach-In, and Take Your Child to Work Day. This includes reading and writing follow-up activities that encourage the students to analyze and synthesize the information gained from these experiences.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase proficiency of bottom quartile students in grades 3 - 5	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase proficiency for ELL students in ELA grades K - 5	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase literacy in grades K - 2	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>