

Duval County Public Schools

Martin Luther King, Jr Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	11
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Martin Luther King, Jr Elementary School

8801 LAKE PLACID DR E, Jacksonville, FL 32208

<http://www.duvalschools.org/mlking>

Demographics

Principal: Cindy Gentry V

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 in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: D 2016-17: C 2015-16: D 2014-15: D 2013-14: C
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Martin Luther King Jr. F.A.M.E. Academy will provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement

At Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary, every student is inspired and prepared for success in middle school and beyond.

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
Gentry, Cindy	Principal	
Payne, Marva	Guidance Counselor	
Willis, Andrea	Assistant Principal	
Douglas, Lamnette	Instructional Coach	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	58	63	41	65	70	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361
Attendance below 90 percent	16	21	16	10	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	2	8	5	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	220	47	24	44	57	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	446

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	12	34	20	26	50	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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

18

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/31/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	21	24	21	21	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	8	10	3	10	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	3	5	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	19	29	33	57	62	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	240

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	23	32	33	51	45	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	211

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	23%	50%	57%	23%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	34%	56%	58%	31%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	50%	53%	27%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	48%	62%	63%	33%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	55%	63%	62%	46%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	52%	51%	38%	48%	47%
Science Achievement	22%	48%	53%	27%	55%	55%

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	58 (0)	63 (0)	41 (0)	65 (0)	70 (0)	64 (0)	361 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	16 (0)	21 (0)	16 (0)	10 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	73 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	8 (0)	5 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)	25 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (0)	4 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	8 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	220 (0)	47 (0)	24 (0)	44 (0)	57 (0)	54 (0)	446 (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	31%	51%	-20%	58%	-27%
	2018	26%	50%	-24%	57%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	19%	52%	-33%	58%	-39%
	2018	19%	49%	-30%	56%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	19%	50%	-31%	56%	-37%
	2018	28%	51%	-23%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	61%	7%	62%	6%
	2018	36%	59%	-23%	62%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		32%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	32%	64%	-32%	64%	-32%
	2018	18%	60%	-42%	62%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
	2018	47%	61%	-14%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		29%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	21%	49%	-28%	53%	-32%
	2018	29%	56%	-27%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	6	28	28	17	56	71					
BLK	22	32	39	47	55	62	19				
FRL	22	32	38	46	55	62	17				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	3	20	21	8	26	29					
BLK	23	31	29	33	46	39	29				
FRL	19	30	27	30	45	38	23				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	288
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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

Science proficiency was the data component with the lowest performance at 22% of fifth grade students scoring 3 or higher. Performance can be attributed to our students' poor reading skills and ability to comprehend grade level texts.

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

The only data component with a decline was Science Proficiency. Science proficiency has declined over the past five years and can be attributed students' inability to read, comprehend, and synthesize non-fiction and technical texts.

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

The ELA proficiency of our fourth grade students is the data component with the largest gap when compared to the state average. This gap can be contributed to a lack of consistent, high-quality, standards-based instruction (teacher vacancy).

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

The Learning Gains of the Lowest Performing Quartile is the area that showed the most improvement. The implementation of Acaletics during a dedicated intervention block contributed to the increase, as well as, focused and specific small group instruction for LPQ students each day with the Math Coach or Principal.

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

Poor attendance and the number of students who scored in the lowest achievement level on FSA are both areas of concern.

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

1. To increase the ELA Proficiency of all students and subgroups
2. Decrease the number of students with attendance below 90 percent
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Reading Proficiency of African American Students
Rationale	African American students constitute nearly the entire student population of our school; therefore, the performance of this subgroup is consistent with the school's overall performance in reading and writing with 78% of AA students scoring in the below-proficient range.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May 2020, we will increase the reading proficiency of African American students from 22% to 36% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment for ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	To increase the proficiency of this sub-group we will utilize direct instruction for differentiated groups of students, additional small group instruction for students in this sub-group who are also in the lowest performing quartile, and standards-based instruction using the gradual release of responsibility model for instructional delivery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction will allow the instructor to provide more explicit instruction, feedback, monitoring of student performance. Student engagement with lessons will increase, as struggling readers tend to get lost during whole group instruction. Close proximity to the teacher will also increase time on task. Direct instruction has been shown to improve the reading skills of struggling readers. Gradual release will allow the teacher to model fluency and the internal thinking of proficient readers, while giving students adequate opportunity to receive guided instruction with feedback and work collaboratively with peers before working independently.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide reading intervention using Corrective Reading. 2. Provide additional small group instruction for African American students who are in the lowest performing quartile and those who scored a Level 1 on their most recent FSA ELA Assessment. 3. Hire 3 additional full-time paraprofessionals and one tutor to provide small group instruction. 4. The Reading Coach will work with teachers to plan standards-based lessons and interventions. 5.
Person Responsible	Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Reading and Math Proficiency of Students with Disabilities
Rationale	Students with Disabilities performed less well than students in all other sub-groups with the lowest performance in Math and ELA proficiency.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May 2020, we will increase the reading and math proficiency of Students with Disabilities by 10 percentage points each, as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment for ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>To increase the proficiency of this sub-group the VE Resource teachers will provide direct instruction for reading and math in a small group setting.</p> <p>Small group instruction will allow the instructor to provide more explicit instruction, feedback, and monitoring of student performance. Ongoing progress monitoring during small group instruction will allow the teacher to continually diagnosis and correct deficiencies. Close proximity to the teacher will also increase time on task. Direct instruction has been shown to improve the reading skills of struggling readers. Reading Mastery or Corrective Reading will be used depending on the level of the reader. Explicit instruction in Numbers and Operations in Base-Ten, as well as Operations and Algebra will be used for math.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide reading intervention using Corrective Reading or Reading Mastery depending on the level of the student. . 2. Provide additional small group instruction for Students with Disabilities who are in the lowest performing quartile and those who scored a Level 1 on their most recent FSA ELA Assessment. 3. Hire 3 additional full-time paraprofessionals and one tutor to provide small group instruction. 4. The Reading Coach will work with teachers to plan standards-based lessons and interventions.
Person Responsible	Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)

#3	
Title	Reading Proficiency of Economically Disadvantaged Students
Rationale	Economically Disadvantaged students constitute nearly the entire student population of our school; therefore, the performance of this subgroup is consistent with the school's overall performance in reading and writing with 78% of ED students scoring in the below-proficient range.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May 2020, we will increase the reading proficiency of African American students from 22% to 36% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment for ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	To increase the proficiency of this sub-group we will utilize direct instruction for differentiated groups of students, additional small group instruction for students in this sub-group who are also in the lowest performing quartile, and standards-based instruction using the gradual release of responsibility model for instructional delivery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction will allow the instructor to provide more explicit instruction, feedback, monitoring of student performance. Student engagement with lessons will increase, as struggling readers tend to get lost during whole group instruction. Close proximity to the teacher will also increase time on task. Direct instruction has been shown to improve the reading skills of struggling readers. Gradual release will allow the teacher to model fluency and the internal thinking of proficient readers, while giving students adequate opportunity to receive guided instruction with feedback and work collaboratively with peers before working independently.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide reading intervention using Corrective Reading. 2. Provide additional small group instruction for African American students who are in the lowest performing quartile and those who scored a Level 1 on their most recent FSA ELA Assessment. 3. Hire 3 additional full-time paraprofessionals and one tutor to provide small group instruction. 4. Provide additional field studies to increase the real-world experiences and content knowledge of students in this population. 5. Conduct a Book Study using the Text Poor Students, Rich Teaching by Eric Jensen to increase their knowledge of techniques that are effective with this sub-group. 6. The Reading Coach will work with teachers to plan standards-based lessons and interventions.
Person Responsible	Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)

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)

Improving student attendance is a schoolwide priority. To address this issue, we will tier students according to the number of absences they had in the previous year (10 to 17 absences and more than 18 absences). For those students who have attendance below 90 percent, we will meet with their parents to discuss the barriers they are experiencing and develop action plans to help them overcome those barriers (social services, etc.). For students with 10 to 17 absences, we will monitor their attendance closely.

In addition to attendance, improving school culture and climate is another priority. We will implement our PBIS plan with fidelity.

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, § 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

Parental involvement is vital to student achievement. Parent Professional development opportunities will be offered monthly. We would like 25% of our parents to take part in these offerings. We will conduct parent conferences during the 1st and 3rd nine weeks, with a goal of 75% parent participation.

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

At Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School our goal is to meet the needs of the whole child. Our guidance counselor provides monthly character trait lessons through the Learning for Life Program. In primary classrooms, teachers help students learn social skills using the Sanford Harmony Curriculum. The Calm Classroom Program helps students learn mindfulness techniques which increases emotional regulation. Because our school is a Full Service Plus School, students may receive mental health counseling on site. The school has a partnership with Ribault Full Service Schools and the Boys and Girls Club of Northeast Florida. The school houses the Giving Closet Project which provides clothing, shoes, toiletries and other essentials for students in need. A wellness room has been implemented and is a place where students who are in crisis or need additional emotional and social support may go to decompress and speak to a trusted adult about what is going on. The school has adopted a restorative justice approach to discipline which allows students who have wronged others to make amends and allows their victims to have a voice and to have their needs addressed. The full staff has received ALERT training so they know how to respond to various issues students might be experiencing such as bullying, behavior issues,

mental health conditions, abuse, crisis, etc. With the exception of brand new teachers, all have been trained in Youth Mental Health First Aid which gives teachers the tools to notice signs and symptoms of mental health conditions, how to respond, and the resources available to assist students.

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

At Martin L. King, Jr. Elementary, Jr. Elementary School, we have one Pre-Kindergarten classes and two Head Start classes, which increase the transitional learning at the school-based level. Pre-K and Head Start students are assessed throughout the school year using the VPK Assessment, Get Ready to Read, Brigance, PLS-5, and Teaching Strategies Gold. This allows teachers and administrators to evaluate the effectiveness of the early learning programs. When students enter kindergarten in the Fall, they are assessed using the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Assessment to determine the effectiveness of early learning instruction. Incoming Kindergarten students are assessed upon entering school to assist in differentiated instruction, as well as intervention strategies and programs. All students are assessed using Reading Mastery Signature Edition, I-Ready Reading and I-Ready Mathematics.

Screening data will be collected and disaggregated by the end of September 2019 and used to plan instruction for students; including those who need interventions. Instruction will include modeling, guided practice, and independent practice of all areas identified by screening data. Students who need additional reading support will participate in direct instruction using Reading Mastery Signature Edition.

After data is gathered and analyzed, teachers will group students according to areas of non proficiency. Teachers will provide remediation based on identified skills and standards during teacher-led groups to address foundational skills, as well as guided reading.

To prepare fifth graders for middle school, they learn study skills such as using an agenda/planner, monitor their own progress through the district's student portal, participate in goal-setting conferences, and track their own data in their Student Success Binders. During the school year we meet with students to discuss their options for middle school. Near the end of the year, students visit their neighborhood middle school for an orientation session presented by administration, guidance, and students.

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

The School Improvement Plan is the guiding document for the work of the school. The Leadership Team leads the faculty in a data review and together develop the initial draft of the School Improvement Plan. The draft SIP is then presented to the School Advisory Council for review and recommendations. The School's Leadership Team finalizes the plan and monitors the fidelity of implementation.

The School's Leadership Team will regularly revise and update the plan as the needs of students change throughout the school year. The plan includes a formal review process which demonstrates how the school utilizes data to inform instruction and makes mid-

course adjustments as data are analyzed.

Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students receive additional remediation through after-school programs and/or summer school. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III to ensure staff development needs are provided.

Title I, Part D

District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention programs.

Title II

Supplemental funds for improving basic education programs using technology in classrooms will be used to provide individualized instruction using the i-Ready and Achieve 3000 blended learning platforms. These engaging computer-based programs adapt to students' current level of performance and construct a learning path designed to increase achievement in literacy and mathematics.

Title X- Homeless

In order to eliminate barriers to a free and appropriate education, the District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) under the Ribault Full Service Program and United Way for students identified as homeless.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide after-school tutoring for struggling students, SAI funds will be used to pay for teacher salaries, as well as instructional materials needed for tutoring.

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

N/A

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Reading Proficiency of African American Students	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Reading and Math Proficiency of Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Reading Proficiency of Economically Disadvantaged Students	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00