

Polk County Public Schools

Dr. Ne Roberts 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	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Dr. Ne Roberts Elementary School

6600 GREEN RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

Demographics

Principal: Dorothy Ewing

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (46%) 2014-15: C (50%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Dr. Ne Roberts Elementary School

6600 GREEN RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

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	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

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

Our mission is to work together encouraging each other to become life long learners who are able to solve problems in the real world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is for family, community and staff to build the foundation necessary to create productive citizens.

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
Warren, Timothy	Principal	
Hill, Phyllis	School Counselor	
Burroughs, Dana	Instructional Coach	
Clopton, Diana	Other	
Bell, Erica	School Counselor	
Jones, Rachel	Assistant Principal	

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	114	111	111	148	114	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	737
Attendance below 90 percent	9	28	27	28	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	5	6	7	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
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	27	34	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133

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	1	4	8	23	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

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	6	9	10	12	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	3	9	4	8	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	5	14	21	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
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	3	5	8	18	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	6	9	10	12	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	3	9	4	8	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	5	14	21	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
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	3	5	8	18	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	44%	51%	57%	47%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	51%	58%	56%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	49%	53%	49%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	57%	63%	63%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	56%	62%	75%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	47%	51%	65%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	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	114 (0)	111 (0)	111 (0)	148 (0)	114 (0)	139 (0)	737 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	9 (6)	28 (9)	27 (10)	28 (12)	14 (22)	23 (19)	129 (78)
One or more suspensions	0 (3)	5 (9)	6 (4)	7 (8)	9 (5)	7 (6)	34 (35)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (8)	0 (5)	0 (14)	0 (21)	0 (8)	0 (4)	0 (60)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	27 (0)	34 (0)	72 (0)	133 (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	40%	52%	-12%	58%	-18%
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	48%	-8%	58%	-18%
	2018	46%	48%	-2%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	50%	47%	3%	56%	-6%
	2018	66%	50%	16%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	56%	11%	62%	5%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	56%	0%	64%	-8%
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	64%	51%	13%	60%	4%
	2018	69%	56%	13%	61%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	45%	4%	53%	-4%
	2018	61%	51%	10%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
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	12	34	44	33	44	24	20				
ELL	39	48	50	65	60	60	44				
BLK	30	52	65	53	58	38	31				
HSP	41	47	39	64	62	59	48				
MUL	40	50		70	60						
WHT	54	61	70	68	55	38	67				
FRL	39	54	55	60	57	49	45				
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	23	49	52	31	48	53	42				
ELL	36	45	40	62	59	50					
BLK	39	53	38	51	52	42	50				
HSP	54	63	58	72	70	50	75				
MUL	64			91							
WHT	58	69	75	67	66	63	64				
FRL	45	59	54	63	63	51	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	14	38	37	24	55	57	26				
ELL	31	53	42	55	76	58	20				
BLK	22	48	50	44	66	65	20				
HSP	47	52	43	67	81	68	48				
WHT	59	61	53	70	74	63	65				
FRL	34	53	50	52	70	58	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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	54
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	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	53
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	55
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	59
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	54
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.

Math bottom 25% performed the lowest on the FSA with 43% of the students demonstrating a learning gain. The two major factors that contributed to the poor performance were having teachers teach multiple grade level content areas (i.e. teaching 4th and 5th grade math/science content) and there was a long-term substitute in a 4th math grade classroom; she was the fifth teacher for the students.

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

Science proficiency experienced the greatest decline in student performance from the previous year. Student proficiency decreased from 61% to 49% (-12%). One teacher taught 4th and 5th grade science content and it was overwhelming for her. In addition, the same teacher experienced health issues which resulted in multiple absences, so students were not sufficiently taught science content.

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.

ELA has the greatest gap between our school and the state. The major contributing factors are: (1) K-2 student are not reading on grade level by the end of each year and (2) K-2 teachers need additional training and support with struggling readers.

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

3rd Grade Math proficiency showed the most improvement. There were no new actions, rather built capacity through training and support over the past four (4) years.

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

The most significant area of concern from the Early Warning System (EWS) is attendance. On average, 20% of students on each grade level are absent from school. As result, these students are not in school receiving a standards-based education.

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

1. Allow 3rd-5th grade teachers to teach only one grade level.
2. Provide additional ELA support K-5 (i.e. hire reading tutors at all grade levels and use Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) daily to supplement teacher instruction).
3. Monitor 4th and 5th grade math teachers to ensure that they are meeting daily with students in small differentiated groups.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase overall reading proficiency from 44% to the district average (51%).
Rationale	School overall reading performance is 7% below the district average. K-5 reading proficiency must increase to build capacity to support reading in the content area of science.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Overall school reading performance will increase 7% from 44% to 51% to meet the district average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shanda Berry (shanda.berry@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	3rd-5th grade reading teachers will be trained in Guided Reading. 3rd-5th grade reading teachers will implement differentiated teacher-led groups daily. 3rd-5th grade reading teachers will identify students in the low 25%. Students will be progress monitored for growth using MTSS and instruction will be refined to meet student n
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Training 3rd-5th grade reading teachers in Guided Reading will provide them with the skills needed to assist struggling readers.. Implementing differentiated teacher-led groups daily will allow teachers to meet the individual needs of each student. Students identified in the low 25% need additional support from the Title I Tutors, Reading Coach and Reading Resource Teacher to accelerate their learning.
Action Step	
Description	1. The Literacy Coaches will train teachers to use Guided Reading. 2. Monitor teachers to ensure that they implement teacher-led groups daily. 3. Students identified in the low 25% will receive supplemental instruction from the Reading Interventionist, Reading Resource Teacher and Title I Instructional Paras. 4. Purchase and utilize Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) kits as a resource instruction struggling readers.
Person Responsible	Timothy Warren (timothy.warren@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Increase 3rd-5th grade SWDs reading proficiency.
Rationale	3rd-5th grade SWDs overall reading proficiency was 12%, which is over 17% below other subgroups.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	3rd-5th grade SWDs overall reading proficiency will increase 15% from 12% to 27%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Phyllis Hill (phyllis.hill@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>3rd-5th grade students with disabilities will be identified.</p> <p>3rd-5th grade students with disabilities will receive additional instruction. Teachers will review the IEPs for 3rd-5th grade students with disabilities to ensure that their accommodations are provided.</p> <p>Teachers must know which students have IEPs, so accommodations can be provided to ensure student success.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Students with disabilities need additional instruction to accelerate their learning.</p> <p>Teachers must be familiar with each students' IEP to ensure that students receive the accommodation required for them to experience success.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify SWDs. 2. Review student IEPs with teachers. 3. Identify each student's accommodations. 4. Make sure at least 30% of students receiving additional support are SWDs. 5. Progress-monitor SWDs and refine instruction as needed.
Person Responsible	Timothy Warren (timothy.warren@polk-fl.net)

#3	
Title	Increase 3rd-5th grade math low 25% gains to 47%.
Rationale	Currently, math low 25% gains are 43%, which is 4% below the district average of 47%. Students identified in the low 25% require additional support to accelerate their learning.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	3rd-5th grade math low 25% gains will increase 4% from 43% to 47%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dana Burroughs (dana.burroughss@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	3rd-5th grade math teachers will provide students identified in the low 25% will differentiated instruction daily. 3rd-5th grade math teachers will meet with students identified in the low 25% daily. 3rd-5th grade math teachers will use standards-based scaffolded materials. 3rd-5th grade math teachers will ensure standards-task alignment for all assignments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	3rd-5th grade math teachers will provided differentiated instruction to students identified in the low 25% to ensure their individual needs are met. 3rd-5th grade math teachers will meet daily with students identified in the low 25% to make certain learning is accelerated. 3rd-5th grade math teachers will ensure that all assignments are aligned to the standard, so students will be prepared for standards-based assessments.
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify students in the low 25%. 2. Purchase and utilize academic software on iPads to differentiated instruction. 3. Utilize collaborative planning to develop standards-based mini-assessments to monitor student progress. 4. Analyze student tasks to ensure work is rigorous and aligned to the standard. 5. Schedule the Math Coach to model best practices in classroom with Tier 2/3 teachers.
Person Responsible	Timothy Warren (timothy.warren@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).

During the 2018-2019 school year, 4 teachers taught multiple grade level content. In 2019-2020, we will not use this model resulting in 100% of teachers teaching content for one (1) grade level. Additionally, in 2018-2019, there were only three (3) individuals providing supplemental support to K-5 teachers in ELA to accelerate student learning. We will improve the level of K-5 ELA support by using Title I Funds to hire an additional Reading Resource Teacher and Title Instructional Paras and direct the Reading Coach to provide an hour of direct instruction to students struggling in reading. Lastly, the Math/Science Coach will

also provide an hour of direct instruction to students identified in the low 25%.

The individuals responsible for monitoring will be as follows:

Timothy T. Warren, Principal
 Rachel Jones, Assistant Principal
 Shanda Berry, Reading Coach-Areas
 Diana Clopton, Reading Interventionist
 Sherry Pittman, Reading Resource Teacher
 Dana Burroughs, Math/Science Teacher

The research-based strategies and action steps utilized to monitor are listed below:

The school master schedule will reflect that teachers are only teaching one grade level content area using the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM) for EAL and the 5 E Model for math and science. The Title I budget will reflect the allocation of funds for multiple Title Instructional paras, a Reading Interventionist and a Reading Resource Teacher. Student performance data in the school-wide progress monitoring system will be reviewed by admin and teachers will be emailed standards-based feedback for improving student learning.

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.

The school invites parents to review and assist with the development of the Parental and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP), which builds a positive relationship with stakeholders by informing parents and community members of School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. This afford parents and stakeholders an opportunity to review the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and provide input regarding budget allocations. To involve as many stakeholders as possible, noticed regarding school event are placed on Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, RemindApp, and Class DoJo. In addition, ink and toner is purchased to print and send out colorful flyers in English and Spanish. Also, Spanish translation is provided during events and when communications are sent home. To foster accountability in achieving the school's mission to support the needs of students, the Title I Budget is used to hire a Reading Coach, Reading Interventionist, Reading Resource Teacher, Math/Science Coach and three reading tutors that support student learning. Additionally, stakeholders are informed during school events that Title I funds are also utilize to acquire instructional technology such as iPads to enhance student learning, as well as to fund collaborative planning for teachers to develop standards-based mini-assessments to progress-monitor student knowledge and skills. Please see attached PFEP for full details on how our 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.

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.

To address the social-emotional needs of students, a Response to Intervention Coach (Guidance Counselor), teachers, and leadership members meet monthly to discuss students considered to exhibit warning signs (i.e. depressed, multiple referral, absenteeism, perpetual low grades, tragedy at home, etc.). Their data to include behavior, attendance and academic trends is analyzed to identify which support are needed to ensure student success. The MTSS Coordinator (Guidance Counselor) schedules a Student Success Team (SST) meetings for all students who are at-risk or are exhibiting a change in behavior/attendance/academics. During the SST meeting, necessary supports are utilized to provide a support system that will allow students to be success as evidenced by reduced referrals, increase academic achievement, and improved attendance. Attendees include, but are not limited to the Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, LEA Facilitator, Psychologist, Speech Pathologist, Nurse, and appropriate classroom teachers..Strategies range from daily "check-ins/check-outs" to intervention by the school social worker and mental health counselor. In addition, to support this effort, classroom teacher implement Samford Harmony strategies to build a healthy rapport with students, as well as CHAMPS and PBIS.

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

To support incoming cohorts, such as Pre-K students transitioning into Kindergarten, the school hosts a kindergarten round- up which provides parents with readiness information and tour of the kindergarten classroom. In addition, we have VPK readiness programs on site which provide a familiar environment and bridge transitions for parents, teachers, and students when their student rolls up to kindergarten. Posts are made using social media (i.e. school website, Facebook, Instagram, Class Dojo, Twitter, Instagram, etc.) as well as distributed via flyers and brochures throughout the area to announce upcoming registration for incoming students. The STAR Early Literacy and iStation/Smarty Ants Reading and Freckles Math assessment is administered during the first 30 days of school. The results of these assessments target specific areas of student needs and are utilized be teachers to refine instruction to ensure a successful learning experience.

For outgoing cohorts of students, middle school staff members are invited to visit the school. They present the extracurricular activities, academic expectations, and environmental logistics of their middle school program. In addition, parents are given information regarding middle school orientation deemed just for 5th grade students. In addition, transition IEPs are conducted for students with disabilities. During this process, LEA Facilitators from the middle school meet with IEP team to review and adjust each student's education plan for alignment with the middle school environment.

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.

Based on 2018-2019 FSA data, we will identify our instructional needs. Title I money will be used to fund a Reading Interventionist, Reading Coach, Science Coach, and four (4) instructional paras for K-3rd grade ELA reading support. Remaining 2018-2019 Title I dollars will fund instructional technology, purchase standards-based instructional materials, as well as acquire books for literacy support.

Weekly data chats are used to determine the needs of all students and how resources will be shared. Monthly data meetings are held for each grade level to determine what resources are having the greatest impact. Tier 2 plans are utilized to monitor student and grade-level progress. The Assistant Principal and Media Specialist maintains an accurate inventory of resources.

Walk-throughs with school-based and district coaches, as well as teacher surveys will assist

administrators in identifying and determining the effectiveness of professional development and planning tools.

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

Students are prepared for college readiness in an inclusive environment by receiving a standards-based education, which is differentiated to meet their individual academic and behavioral needs. Career awareness yearly activities are coordinated by the school Guidance Counselor and held at the school site. The Career awareness events (Career Day) invite business and community members to discuss their profession (i.e. education required for the job, average salary, expectations of supervisor, etc.). This allows students to receive firsthand knowledge of college and career expectations. In addition, College Day is utilized to have teachers and staff crate aware of higher education by wearing their college paraphernalia, share details about the college they attended and the steps they had to take in elementary, middle and high school to get admitted.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase overall reading proficiency from 44% to the district average (51%).	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase 3rd-5th grade SWDs reading proficiency.	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase 3rd-5th grade math low 25% gains to 47%.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00