

Broward County Public Schools

# Robert C. Markham Elementary



2020-21 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>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# Robert C. Markham Elementary

1501 NW 15TH AVE, Pompano Beach, FL 33069

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Shedrick Dukes

Start Date for this Principal: 8/22/2017

<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>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (32%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* 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 Broward 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>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

## Robert C. Markham Elementary

1501 NW 15TH AVE, Pompano Beach, FL 33069

[ no web address on file ]

### 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	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	100%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.**

Markham Elementary ensures maximum student progress by developing the whole child in pursuit of academic and social excellence within a safe and secure learning community.

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

Markham Elementary ensures that all scholars receive an individualized approach to an unparalleled quality education through highly engaged collaborative learning, enhanced technology, and global communication in preparation for college and career readiness.

### 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
Dukes, Shedrick	Principal	Supervise School Mission & Operations Alignment of Curriculum and Assessments Budget/Class Size Reduction Classroom Observations Faculty/Staff Evaluations Weekly Rtl & Support Staff Meetings Promotion/Retention SAC/SAF/PTA SIG/ESSA/TIF Grants Weekly Staff Newsletter Partnerships, City Chamber & Commission Monthly Faculty Meetings Content Planning K-2nd Grade 21st Century Grant
Levine, Erica	Assistant Principal	All Schedules Facilities Management Classroom Observations Faculty/Staff Evaluations Monthly Leadership Meetings Cafeteria & AM/PM Duties Communications & Parent Link Safety Team Leader Behavior Support/Discipline Monthly Parent Newsletter Science Contact & Competitions Science Parent Workshops Science Planning 3-5 Science Assessments & Analysis
Johnson, Derica	Instructional Coach	Acaletics & Math Blocks Math Parent Workshops Math IFC Math Assessments & Analysis Student Support Math Planning K-5 Title I Co-Liaison Math Games & Competitions
Marshall, Sebrina	Instructional Coach	K-5 Power Hour & Balanced Literacy ELA Parent Workshops ELA Instructional Focus Calendar (IFC) ELA Assessments & Analysis Student Support ELA Planning K-5 Magnet Coordinator Vocabulary & Spelling Competitions



## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Tuesday 8/22/2017, Shedrick Dukes

**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.*

**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.*

### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 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>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (32%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A

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

## 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/22/2020

### 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	82	79	84	104	79	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	7	7	4	8	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	32	40	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

**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	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	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	
Number of students enrolled	82	79	84	104	79	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	7	7	4	8	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	32	40	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

**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	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	35%	59%	57%	21%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	60%	58%	39%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	73%	54%	53%	45%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	54%	65%	63%	36%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	66%	62%	59%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	53%	51%	59%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	17%	46%	53%	14%	45%	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	33%	60%	-27%	58%	-25%
	2018	35%	59%	-24%	57%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	62%	-19%	58%	-15%
	2018	20%	58%	-38%	56%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	20%	59%	-39%	56%	-36%
	2018	22%	56%	-34%	55%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	65%	-8%	62%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	37%	63%	-26%	62%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	67%	-17%	64%	-14%
	2018	38%	63%	-25%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	35%	64%	-29%	60%	-25%
	2018	36%	62%	-26%	61%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	14%	49%	-35%	53%	-39%
	2018	14%	51%	-37%	55%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	9	57	73	23	40	36					
ELL	35	60	67	55	64	57	18				
BLK	36	68	81	55	56	48	21				
HSP	33	58	63	52	65	60	13				
FRL	33	64	76	54	62	56	18				
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		37	40	8	47						
ELL	31	49	55	48	64	72	22				
BLK	28	42	52	35	50	45	12				
HSP	33	44	53	55	61	82	29				
FRL	31	43	51	42	53	53	17				
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		47		11	67						

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
ELL	20	36	42	39	56	50	13				
BLK	20	42	52	32	60	63	11				
HSP	20	33	33	42	57	45	14				
FRL	20	38	45	36	60	59	13				

### 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	51
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	411
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	51
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	
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	53
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	50
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
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.**

The data shows that our Science scores dropped by 1%. This is our lowest component.

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

Science is the area that showed the greatest decline. We began developing the initial phases of a science curriculum for grades K-5 during the 2018-2019 school year. As we continue this implementation we expect to see considerable growth.

**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.**

Science is the area that showed the greatest decline. We began developing the initial phases of a science curriculum for grades K-5 during the 2018-2019 school year. As we continue this implementation we expect to see considerable growth.

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

Our ELA learning gains for the lowest quartile made the greatest improvement. We attribute this to being able to provide additional staff support with push-in and pull-out interventions, after-school tutoring and during the extended hour block.

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

We noticed that our students with disabilities did not score as proficient in ELA.

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

1. Increase Science proficiency in grade 5, based on school based common formative assessments
2. Increase ELA proficiency in grades K-5, based on BAS progress and iReady assessments
3. Increase SWD proficiency in ELA, based on BAS progress
4. Increase learning gains in Math lowest quartile, based on iReady assessments

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

<b>Area of Focus</b>	Students with Disabilities scored 36% on the Federal Index, which is below the required minimum of 41%. The intent is to increase the proficiency scores of students with disabilities in order to ensure all students make adequate progress.
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By June 2021, Students with Disabilities will score at or above 41% FPPI
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Shedrick Dukes (shedrick.dukes@browardschools.com)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Increase SWD proficiency by implementing the UFLI small group intervention in the classroom and the addition of Wilson Foundations as a tool for weekly pullout support. The classroom teacher will utilize UFLI and the Educational Support Professional will implement Foundations.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	University of Florida Literacy Initiative (UFLI) is a research based reading intervention that has demonstrated the ability to boost phonemic awareness and fluency. Foundations is a research based program that has demonstrated the same results for students that exhibit significant skills deficiencies. By training all teachers in the UFLI model and providing Foundations as a supplemental program we will be able to target the specific needs of SWD and maintain a portfolio of their progress.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Pre-Assessment in August
2. Instructional Focus Calendar aligned to results
3. Mid-year Assessment and tutorials will be provided after school
4. Weekly intervention labs provided by support personnel
5. Post-Assessments in April, prior to the state assessment

**Person Responsible** Erica Levine (erica.levine@browardschools.com)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**

**Area of Focus** In order to increase the proficiency rates of students, teachers must become more effective at implementing higher order learning activities. Students currently scored 35% proficiency on the 2018-19 Florida Standards Assessment

**Description and Rationale:**

**Measurable Outcome:** By June 2020, 40% of 3rd-5th grade students will score proficient on the Florida Standards Assessment

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Sebrina Marshall (sebrina.marshall@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The University of Florida Literacy Initiative (UFLI) in conjunction with the district balanced literacy plan will be implemented.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Inquiry based learning  
Standards based instruction  
Reading content will integrate the science and social studies standards to increase student background knowledge  
iReady and School City will be utilized to assess student progress

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Pre-Assessment in August
2. Instructional Focus Calendar aligned to results
3. Mid-year Assessment and tutorials will be provided after school
4. Weekly intervention labs provided by support personnel
5. Post-Assessments in April, prior to the state assessment

**Person Responsible** Sebrina Marshall (sebrina.marshall@browardschools.com)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**We will maintain the systems and structures implemented last year in order to continue growth towards the remaining priorities.**

**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.

The target for a positive school culture and environment is to continue to increase the level of parent involvement at this school. We have had an upward trend which reflects the increased effort placed upon engaging parents through monthly education-based trainings, School advisory council meetings and student events held in the evenings when parents are more easily accessible. Our goal is to continue to conduct activities, such as Literacy and Math Nights in order to involve all stakeholders in the educational process.

#### 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.

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities</b>				<b>\$23,157.90</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	150-Aides	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$13,972.00
			<i>Notes: MES: Fund 80% of salary and fringe for one paraprofessional to support the implementation of Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) and content area interventions in all grade levels through the use of small group instruction.</i>			
	5100	200-Employee Benefits	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$9,185.90
			<i>Notes: Fringe Benefits for 80% Paraprofessional</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction</b>				<b>\$82,401.83</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6300	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$37,489.60
			<i>Notes: MES: Fund 80% of one Instructional Coach to support the implementation of Balanced Literacy and hands on learning in all content areas of study</i>			
	6300	200-Employee Benefits	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$14,110.92
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coach Fringe Benefits</i>			

	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$15,456.00
			<i>Notes: MES: Fund 80% of salary and fringe for one pool sub to be at the school daily so teachers can attend professional development with no gaps in instruction for students.</i>			
	6400	200-Employee Benefits	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$1,845.31
			<i>Notes: Pool Sub Fringe Benefits</i>			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$11,700.00
			<i>Notes: 15 K-5 Teachers will participate in professional learning on core content instruction</i>			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$1,800.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coaches will participate in professional learning on core content instruction</i>			
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$128,812.56</b>