

Lake Wales Charter Schools

Polk Avenue Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Polk Avenue Elementary School

110 POLK AVE E, Lake Wales, FL 33853

<http://lwcharterschools.com/polkave>

Demographics

Principal: Anna Barcenas

Start Date for this Principal: 4/1/2007

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 (54%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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

N/A

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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Polk Avenue Elementary School

110 POLK AVE E, Lake Wales, FL 33853

<http://lwcharterschools.com/polkave>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	70%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	C

School Board Approval

N/A

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 Polk Avenue Elementary is to educate and challenge students to discover the leader in themselves, empowering them to become responsible and contributing citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Polk Avenue Elementary is "Leadership Begins Here".

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Quam, Gail	Principal	Our leadership team is a critical part of shared decision making. Mrs. Quam and Mrs Hixenbaugh do make the final decision as the instructional leaders, but our resource teachers have a lot of input. Mrs. Quam and Mrs Hixenbaugh do instructional observations and provide feedback.
Hixenbaugh, Shay	Assistant Principal	Our leadership team is a critical part of shared decision making. Mrs. Quam and Mrs Hixenbaugh do make the final decision as the instructional leaders, but our resource teachers have a lot of input. Mrs. Quam and Mrs Hixenbaugh do instructional observations and provide feedback.
Saran, Ambica	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Saran is our Title I and Math Resource Teacher. She works on data for the team and presents in a format everyone can use. In addition she directly supervises math and holds monthly professional development as well as works with our math consultant.
Kelly, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Kelly provides science instruction to all of our students. She meets with 3-5th grade students weekly and K-2 monthly. She works with the teachers to ensure that science instruction is happening at a high level and provides professional development for the teachers.
Fletcher, Melanie	Other	Ms. Fletcher is the ESE Facilitator and she work with teachers on the MTSS process.
Roe, Patti	Instructional Coach	Ms. Roe is our Reading Resource Teacher and she tutors struggling students and supports reading teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 4/1/2007, Anna Barcenas

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 (54%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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 .	

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	107	85	92	102	70	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	537
Attendance below 90 percent	22	10	12	7	25	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	5	1	3	8	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	2	5	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	15	0	1	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 5/19/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	112	92	94	102	71	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	556
Attendance below 90 percent	13	11	6	5	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	22	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	19	2	1	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	
Number of students enrolled	112	92	94	102	71	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	556
Attendance below 90 percent	13	11	6	5	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	22	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	19	2	1	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	41%	0%	57%	34%	0%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	0%	58%	51%	0%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	0%	53%	58%	0%	52%
Math Achievement	50%	0%	63%	51%	0%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	0%	62%	56%	0%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	0%	51%	56%	0%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	0%	53%	62%	0%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	34%			58%	-24%
	2018	30%			57%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%			58%	-14%
	2018	37%			56%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	46%			56%	-10%
	2018	38%			55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	44%			62%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	40%			62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%			64%	-14%
	2018	51%			62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	56%			60%	-4%
	2018	68%			61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%			53%	-5%
	2018	51%			55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	22	33	42	27	44	47					
ELL	31	56	44	51	68	50	45				
BLK	36	56		38	47	50	33				
HSP	37	58	50	51	68	57	58				
WHT	51	66		59	71		50				
FRL	40	58	57	48	65	58	47				

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	9	57	60	19	36						
ELL	16	50	69	38	56	36	27				
BLK	30	50		43	63		40				
HSP	29	54	61	47	67	35	52				
WHT	45	40	27	65	73	55	62				
FRL	33	49	52	49	67	45	47				

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

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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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 achievement component showed the lowest performance. Our student lack language experience and thus their vocabulary is low and is a contributing factor to lower test scores. We did have 2 new teachers in our third grade. Attendance is also a factor for our school.

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

Science achievement showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Math and Science block time had to be reduced to add additional power hour to the ELA block as our school was on the lowest 300 reading schools list.

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 achievement shows the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Our student lack language experience and thus their vocabulary is low and is a contributing factor to lower test scores. We did have 2 new teachers in our third grade.

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

ELA learning gains showed the most improvement. We added a new phonetic program as well as a writing program with higher rigor. We believe that the writing scores helped our learning gains.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance is an area of concern.
Our Level 1 students are another area of concern.
Our SWD is a subgroup that we will be focusing on as well.

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

1. Students with Disability
2. Level 1 students
3. Attendance
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Providing research based instruction requires professional development based upon action research.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase English Language Arts FSA achievement by 3% from 41% to 44%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patti Roe (patti.roe@lwcharterschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The programs that we will be using in the classroom have the following evidence-based strategies: 1. Summarization 2. Inferencing 3. Build schema
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We used the What Works Clearinghouse to ensure that we are using evidence based strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Plan, schedule, conduct, and participate in reading professional development including, but not limited to, " Standard based Language Arts lessons, Saxon Phonics, and Top Score writing.
2. Teachers will be trained on standards.
3. ELA family involvement night will be held to provide training and resources for parents to help their child at home.
4. Provide ELA tutoring for selected students.

Person Responsible Patti Roe (patti.roe@lwcharterschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Basic facts are the building blocks to math success. By incorporating basic fact fluency practice during the school day we will build a strong foundation. Success in Mathematics is based on emphasizing conceptual understanding over procedures. We will engage students and encourage their curiosity through authentic problems.

Measurable Outcome: Increase Mathematics FSA achievement by 3% from 50% to 53%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ambica Saran (ambica.randev@lwcharterschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 1. Math Fact Fluency for a minimum of 10 minutes daily.
 2. We provide explicit and implicit systematic instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We used the What Works Clearinghouse to ensure that we are using evidence based strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Regular practice of math facts using Rocket Math
2. Building conceptual knowledge through Eureka Math for long term success
3. Math family involvement night will be held to provide training and resources to parents to help their child at home.
4. Math Tutoring will be provided to struggling students
5. We will use Khan Academy for grades 3-5 and Freckle for grades K-2 for remediation and Tier 2.

Person Responsible Ambica Saran (ambica.randev@lwcharterschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science knowledge can be improved by exposing student to a variety of non-fiction materials which is provided in our new reading series.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Science FSA achievement by 3% from 49% to 52%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Kelly (melissa.kelly@lwcharterschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building background knowledge. 2. Provide hands on student centered experiences.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We used the What Works Clearinghouse to ensure that we are using evidence based strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. K-5 Teachers will use periodic non fiction materials, 3-5 Science Boot Camp nonfiction materials, and Ready Gen for the classrooms.
2. Science family involvement night will be held to provide training and resources for parents to help their child at home.
3. Each grade level will take one field trip annually to help build background.

Person Responsible Melissa Kelly (melissa.kelly@lwcharterschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The other three areas of focus are:

- 1. Attendance - Attendance team identifies, monitors, and tracks attendance data of our chronic absentee students. Our social worker in collaboration with administration work with the families of these chronic absentee students.**
- 2. Level 1 students - Classroom, resource, or intervention teachers will provide additional tutoring to our level 1 students in 4th & 5th grade.**
- 3. Students with disabilities - Our ESE inclusion resource teacher and para will assist the students with disabilities in the classes and will provide additional tutoring.**

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Polk Avenue implements Leader in Me (LIM), PAX good behavior games, and Positive Behavior Support (PBS) strategies for building a positive school culture and environment at our school.

Leader in Me is a whole-school transformation model and process that empowers students with the leadership and life skills they need to thrive in the 21st century. It is based on principles and practices of personal, interpersonal and organizational effectiveness, and upon the powerful premise that every child possesses unique strengths and has the ability to be a leader. The "Leader in Me" program is based on the "Seven Habits of Highly Effective People" by Steven Covey.

The PAX Good Behavior Game is a universal-level classroom-based behavior management strategy for elementary schools designed to prevent disruptive activity.

PBS provides a process to understand and resolve the problem behavior of individuals or children. It offers an approach to develop an understanding of why the child engages in problem behavior and strategies to prevent the occurrence of problem behavior while teaching the child new skills. Positive behavior support offers a holistic approach that considers all factors that have an impact on a child and the child's behavior.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$159,342.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	1351 - Polk Avenue Elementary School	General Fund		\$63,098.00
	5100	100-Salaries	1351 - Polk Avenue Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$67,881.00
	5100	100-Salaries	1351 - Polk Avenue Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$28,363.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$75,038.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	1351 - Polk Avenue Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$75,038.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$77,933.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	1351 - Polk Avenue Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$77,933.00
Total:						\$312,313.00