

Suwannee County Schools

Suwannee Intermediate 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	12
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Suwannee Intermediate School

1419 WALKER AVE SW, Live Oak, FL 32064

sis.suwannee.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Beach

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2019

2018-19 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School 4-5
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 English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: D 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: C 2013-14: D
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A
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 Suwannee 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Suwannee Intermediate School will educate all students in a safe and supportive learning environment that will develop life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement

Suwannee County School District will be a system of excellence ensuring all students are prepared for personal success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Beach, Jennifer	Principal
Principal	
Eakins, Joe	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Stevens, Wendy	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Cherry, Keith	Dean
Dean	
	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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	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

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 7/13/2019

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	75	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	51	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	41	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	157	144	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	301

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	79	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176

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	0	0	0	0	75	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	51	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	41	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	157	144	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	301

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	79	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176

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	47%	53%	57%	45%	53%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	64%	58%	46%	63%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	50%	53%	37%	38%	48%
Math Achievement	45%	55%	63%	41%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains	47%	64%	62%	35%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	31%	51%	19%	22%	47%
Science Achievement	43%	48%	53%	37%	48%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey			
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)		Total
	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (75)	0 (82)	0 (157)
One or more suspensions	0 (51)	0 (64)	0 (115)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (41)	0 (58)	0 (99)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (157)	0 (144)	0 (301)

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: A * in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to < 10 students tested or all students tested scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2019	46%	48%	-2%	58%	-12%
	2018	41%	46%	-5%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
05	2019	46%	47%	-1%	56%	-10%
	2018	47%	48%	-1%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2019	49%	50%	-1%	64%	-15%
	2018	35%	40%	-5%	62%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
05	2019	38%	43%	-5%	60%	-22%
	2018	45%	47%	-2%	61%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	42%	44%	-2%	53%	-11%
	2018	36%	40%	-4%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	17	33	36	19	37	32	23				
ELL	41	48	52	35	44	29	13				
BLK	23	33	29	22	33	29	16				
HSP	43	49	42	41	49	32	37				
MUL	46	59		50	48		41				
WHT	58	59	52	54	52	36	56				
FRL	39	47	44	38	44	35	36				

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	21	37	32	18	28	16	24				
ELL	29	48	37	27	31	19	12				
BLK	28	37	29	25	26	24	27				
HSP	43	51	43	38	34	18	29				

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
MUL	38	39		33	29		33				
WHT	53	48	41	48	39	19	43				
FRL	42	44	36	37	34	20	34				

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	45
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	363
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Black/African American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	52
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	42
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 lowest data component was: Math Gains in the Lowest 25th Percentile. Suwannee Intermediate School (SIS) was 32%. This was up 13 percentage points (19%) from the previous year (2018). It was still 12 percentage points below the year prior (2017) and below the District and State averages.

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

All school data components showed an increase from the prior year. The grade level data (which includes all students tested-not school grade data) indicated decreases in ELA and Math in 5th grade. There was a 1% decrease in ELA achievement, however a 5% increase in the same cohort comparison and a 7% decrease in Math achievement, however a 3% increase in the cohort comparison.

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 data component that has the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Math achievement. In 4th grade SIS had 49% of the students score Level 3 and up. This is an increase of 14 percentage points from the prior year (35%), however the state average is 64%, therefore the gap is 15 percentage points.

5th grade had 38% score Level 3 and up which is a decrease from the 45% the prior year, however it is a 3% increase from the same cohort group. The state average is 60% which indicates a 22 percentage point gap.

The math achievement has fluctuated up and down from 41% to 48% level 3 and above over the past four years. Possible factors that have contributed to this gap could include:

1-change in the leadership at the school four times in four years.
2-curriculum utilized has also changed and not been consistent the prior three years.

This past year the same curriculum was used consistently.

3-unique school configuration (each elementary school has two grade levels)

4-high turn over of teachers

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the lowest quartile learning gains in math. The prior year, 19% of the lowest quartile students showed learning gains. This year, 32% of the lowest quartile students showed learning gains. Focus on the students in the lowest quartile was a high priority this past year. Progress monitoring data was posted in the data room so teachers and the leadership could discuss progress during PLCs. Students in the lowest quartile were each assigned a mentor and mentors met with the students at least once a grading period to go over progress, celebrate achievements, and address weaknesses. Teachers were also provided with additional resources including assistance from the district math coach, computer software that included an adaptive intervention program (Education Galaxy and Lift-Off Intervention), and extra intervention sessions with a math teacher were scheduled prior to testing.

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

Some of the students in the lowest quartile are also students that are part of the EWS data. Attendance and students with two or more indicators indicate potential areas of concern that need to be addressed in our SIP action plan.

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

1. Achievement in ELA, Math, and Science-close achievement gaps
2. Learning gains-continue to focus on lowest quartile students
3. ESSA subgroups
4. School Culture/Environment

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Increase Academic Achievement

Rationale The percentage of students scoring at level 3 and above at SIS is below the district and state average. SIS has demonstrated gains in all achievement areas (+2 in ELA, +4 in math, and +6 in science). In order to move to close the achievement gap, we need to continue to increase the percentage of students scoring at level 3 and above.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Increase ELA achievement from 47% level 3 and above to 54% level 3 and above.
 Increase Math achievement from 44% level 3 and above to 54% level 3 and above.
 Increase Science achievement from 43% level 3 and above to 52% level 3 and above.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jennifer Beach (jennifer.beach@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

Provide grade level content area teams time for professional learning communities (PLCs) to analyze data, plan instruction aligned to the standards, and discuss next steps. "The best way to improve schools is to organize teachers into collaborative teams that clarify what each student must learn and the indicators of learning the team will track, to gather evidence of that learning on an ongoing basis, and to analyze the results together so that they could learn which strategies were working and which were not" (Hattie, 2009).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

"The most important variable in the achievement of students is the quality of instruction they receive on a daily basis (Marzano, 2003; Hattie, 2009). Therefore, to ensure students learn at higher levels, we are going to improve teaching. SIS implemented grade-level content area PLCs last year called Tuesday Talks. Teachers came together to analyze and discuss data, collaboratively plan, and for professional learning. Many teams also met to collaboratively plan and analyze class assessments. This year all teams will be required to participate in their grade level content area PLC three times a month: the first Tuesday each month (Tuesday Talks), on the school monthly PD day, and one additional time each team may schedule. The PLC is the best strategy for creating a system that ensures good teaching and includes data review, instructional planning, sharing results, and reflection therefore; SIS will continue to implement PLCs this year with fidelity.

Action Step

Description

1. Teachers will be expected to participate in PLCs three times each month.
2. Tuesday Talks are scheduled on the calendar the first Tuesday of each month. PD days are also scheduled and on the calendar. Teams will schedule their third PLC on their own. The Team leader will turn in an agenda prior to the PLC and the sign in sheet afterwards.
3. Teachers will use the core curriculum (Ready Reading and Ready Math) and may supplement with other resources.
4. Teachers will use common assessments that are approved by admin.
5. Teachers will have data chats with students each quarter to discuss

progress monitoring, grades, AR progress, strengths and weaknesses.
6.

**Person
Responsible**

[no one identified]

#2	
Title	Increase Learning Gains
Rationale	<p>The percentage of students showing learning gains in ELA and math has increased in the past year. SIS had 51% of the students demonstrate learning gains in ELA (an increase of 5 percentage points from 46%). 47% that showed learning gains in math (an increase of 12 percentage points from 35%).</p> <p>The Lowest quartile students also showed an increase in learning gains in ELA (up 6 percentage points) and an increase of 13 percentage points in math. If SIS students continue to demonstrate increases in the percentage of students with learning gains, we will close the achievement gap and increase the percentage of students scoring level 3 and above.</p>

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Increase ELA learning gains from 51% to 58%. Increase ELA LQ learning gains from 43% to 52%. Increase Math learning gains from 47% to 55%. Increase Math LQ learning gains from 32 to 50%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Provide grade level content area teams time for professional learning communities (PLCs) to analyze data, plan instruction aligned to the standards, and discuss next steps. "The best way to improve schools is to organize teachers into collaborative teams that clarify what each student must learn and the indicators of learning the team will track, to gather evidence of that learning on an ongoing basis, and to analyze the results together so that they could learn which strategies were working and which were not" (Hattie, 2009).</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>"The most important variable in achievement of students is the quality of instruction they receive on a daily basis (Marzano, 2003; Hattie, 2009). Therefore, to ensure students learn at higher levels, we are going to improve teaching. SIS implemented grade level content area PLCs last year called Tuesday Talks. Teachers came together to analyze and discuss data, collaboratively plan, and for professional learning. Many teams also met to collaboratively plan and analyze class assessments. This year all teams will be required to participate in their grade level content area PLC three times a month: the first Tuesday each month (Tuesday Talks), on the school monthly PD day, and one additional time. The PLC is the best strategy for creating a system that ensures good teaching and includes data review, instructional planning, sharing results, and reflection therefore; SIS will continue to implement PLCs to also address learning gains.</p>

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the students in the lowest quartile. 2. Identify the students in the ESSA subcategories (African Americans, ELLs, and SWD) to address specific needs and provide interventions and supports. Discuss and share instructional practices during PLCs. Make arrangements to include ESE teachers so they are available to attend Tuesday Talks. 3. Post above student data in data PLC room (IHOP-Intermediate House of
--------------------	--

Problem Solving) to monitor their progress on Reading and Math Diagnostic assessments during PLCs.

4. Assign students a mentor (from leadership team, special area teachers, and paraprofessionals) that meet with them monthly and/or quarterly as needed to discuss progress monitoring, grades, behavior, AR progress, etc.
5. Develop a schedule to provide Lexonik and/or Lexonik Leap to all ELLs, SWD, students in the lowest quartile, or ESSA subcategories that also scored in Profile 3 on the iReady Reading Diagnostic.
6. Provide morning tutoring before school to students struggling in math.
7. Provide a 45 minute intervention/enrichment time (Team Time) in the master schedule in which a paraprofessional pushes in to assist the classroom teacher with small groups on specific skills.
8. Develop a schedule to accommodate SWD with a teacher or paraprofessional that pushes into the classroom to assist and provide support.
9. Develop a schedule for the ELL paraprofessional to push in the classrooms each day to support ELL students.
10. Provide teachers with additional resources, materials, and software to support students specific learning needs.

**Person
Responsible**

Jennifer Beach (jennifer.beach@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Improve Supportive Environment
Rationale	Children need to feel safe and supported. A healthy, safe, and supportive learning environment promotes innovation, inquiry, and risk taking enabling students to learn and be successful. A supportive environment with systems and routines that are consistently in place promotes learning and decreases interruptions due to off task behaviors.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decrease the number of referrals by 20%. Decrease the number of students with attendance less than 90% by 20%. Increase the number of positive responses on parent survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Implement a positive behavior system based on the philosophy of the book, The Energy Bus by Jon Gordon and developed by teachers and staff with proven principles, ideas, and strategies to improve the school culture, build a positive staff, and develop positive student and teacher leaders. Within the positive behavior system, students will be provided the needed supports to be successful academically. "A number of studies have illustrated that school-wide behavior supports decrease problem behavior, increase time spent in academic instruction, and are associated with improved academic outcomes" (Putnam, Horner, & Algozzine, 2006). Studies show that schools with positive behavior systems in place, can help improve discipline, behavior, and grades. Positive Behavior Support (PBS) is improving student academic and behavior outcomes ensuring all students have access to the most effective and accurately implemented instructional and behavioral practices and interventions possible.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce the book, The Energy Bus by Jon Gordon to teachers and staff during preplanning. 2. Develop (with teachers and staff) a positive behavior system implementing the principles, ideas, and strategies from the book and based on the PBS structures needed to be effective including: expectations, common place rules and procedures, rewards, and consequences. The emphasis is on prevention not punishment, increasing collaboration among supports, and where team building and problem solving is expected, taught, and reinforced. 3. Implement the Genius Hour every two weeks for students that follow rules and procedures, complete work, and demonstrate positive behavior as a school-wide reward. 4. Implement Kagan strategies to engage students in learning. 5. Schedule monthly attendance meetings with teachers, parents, and leadership to address students with attendance issues. 6. Ensure safety drill schedule is followed. 7. Address bullying with all students in each class with the classroom teacher

and the guidance counselor.

8. Assign mentors (leadership staff, special area teachers, and paraprofessionals) to students in the lowest quartile and ESSA subcategories to meet monthly and quarterly.

9. Implement more student discourse and interactions to reflect high expectations and beliefs that value all students and their individual capabilities.

10.

Person

Responsible

Joe Eakins (joseph.eakins@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

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)

Increase home-school communication connection and parent involvement.

1. Teachers will be required to utilize a communication method approved by admin (Remind 101, Class Dojo, etc.)
2. Teachers will be expected to contact all parents during the first 6-weeks of school and keep a log.
3. A parent conference day is scheduled in October??
4. SIS Website, Facebook, and the school event sign will be updated weekly - all events, activities, and current calendar will be posted.
5. A copy of the monthly newsletter will be sent home with the student each month. The newsletter will also be available on the SIS website.
6. The library will be open after school once a month for parents to come in and use the facility with their child.
7. A fall family literacy event and spring family STEM event will be scheduled to involve parents and families.
- 8.

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 Pilot SIP 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

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

The elementary schools in Suwannee County are divided up by every two grade levels. It would be most effective if Suwannee County had traditional K-5 elementary schools. That said, the principals collaborate and coordinate scheduling and programs. Matriculation meetings are held to discuss exceptional education students and students in the MTSS process.

Student profile information forms are shared from school to school to assist with transition and placement.

Upcoming (4th grade) students visit the school for an orientation and tour in May each year.

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

Each grade level (4th and 5th) consists of 3 or 4 teams. Each team per grade level is dedicated to servicing either ELLs, IEPs, or 504s. Each of those individual groups consists of 4-5 teachers per team. Due to this grouping, the ESE and paraprofessional support for each specific group is able to spend more time with their targeted group of students because they are only having to divide their time between 4-5 teachers, rather than 14-15 teachers. Forty minutes of the school day is dedicated to intervention time, "Team Time" (ELA/Math). Phonics and vocabulary are a focus in ELA and multiplication facts is the focus in math this year. Curriculum supporting phonics and vocabulary has been provided to each teacher, as well as, additional district support from the math coordinator. The students (according to FSA scores) that were proficient in this area will work on enrichment activities. These are fluid groups and are constantly changing according to the needs of each individual student.

Federal funds (Title I) provide for staffing of paraprofessionals in the ESE department to meet individualized needs of students.

Federal funds (Title I, Part C) provide for paraprofessionals to provide instructional support for the students who qualify as Migrant students.

Federal funds (Title II) provide for professional development resources.

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

Many business and community members are guest speakers at SIS. Teachers utilize guest speakers to enrich the content and help students see real-world connections. During Celebrate Literacy Week, district and community leaders from all types of work and services visit the classrooms to read and share information about their profession.

The Student Government Association (SGA) also participates in community service projects each year to learn and contribute to their community.

High school students visit SIS and have partnered with our students on various school events.

This year, we hope to include some visits from students that attend college.

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

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Increase Academic Achievement	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Increase Learning Gains	\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Improve Supportive Environment	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00