

Leon County Schools

Roberts 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	12
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Roberts Elementary School

5777 PIMLICO DR, Tallahassee, FL 32309

<https://www.leonschools.net/roberts>

Demographics

Principal: Kim Mcfarland

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2008

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Leon 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

The Roberts Elementary School family will foster a safe, nurturing environment where students reach their fullest potential and become productive, responsible students.

Provide the school's vision statement

Roberts Elementary School will be an engaging, safe and respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

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
McFarland, Kim	Principal	
Lovern, Tara	Teacher, K-12	
Lunsford, Shayla	Teacher, K-12	
Scott, Taita	Assistant Principal	
Sever, Erma	Instructional Media	
Burnette, Lois	Teacher, K-12	
Conrad, Leigh	Teacher, K-12	
Harry, Angeleen	Teacher, K-12	
Lee, Ava	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	139	151	140	160	124	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	859
Attendance below 90 percent	14	9	10	11	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	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	4	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	6	15	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

62

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/17/2019

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	8	9	7	3	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
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	4	2	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	8	9	7	3	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
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	4	2	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	83%	57%	57%	81%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	54%	58%	65%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	47%	53%	58%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	86%	64%	63%	80%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	75%	63%	62%	62%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	45%	51%	43%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	76%	52%	53%	86%	52%	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	139 (0)	151 (0)	140 (0)	160 (0)	124 (0)	145 (0)	859 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	14 (8)	9 (9)	10 (7)	11 (3)	11 (6)	4 (8)	59 (41)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (4)	0 (2)	0 (11)	0 (12)	0 (29)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (1)	6 (13)	17 (11)	27 (25)

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	86%	61%	25%	58%	28%
	2018	86%	61%	25%	57%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	86%	57%	29%	58%	28%
	2018	82%	58%	24%	56%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	76%	56%	20%	56%	20%
	2018	74%	57%	17%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	89%	63%	26%	62%	27%
	2018	87%	64%	23%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	66%	18%	64%	20%
	2018	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	83%	61%	22%	60%	23%
	2018	72%	58%	14%	61%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	76%	54%	22%	53%	23%
	2018	87%	56%	31%	55%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	45	50	54	52	65	61	41				
BLK	53	48	43	73	72	68	15				
HSP	89	69		84	63		75				
MUL	89	64		89	83						
WHT	86	61	69	87	75	62	84				
FRL	76	61	67	77	61	61	59				

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	47	58	46	52	55	48	57				
BLK	43	42	38	30	26	21	56				
HSP	75	69		70	56						
MUL	95	79		86	57		100				
WHT	85	67	62	87	68	53	92				
FRL	70	59	57	62	57	39	73				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	509
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

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	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	76
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	81
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	75
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	66
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 Learning Gains is the lowest component of the 2018-2019 school grade.

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 when comparing scores from 2018 (86%) to 2019 (76%).

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

Roberts Elementary surpassed the state average in all school grade category components.

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

The most improvement was shown in math learning gains for students in the lowest quartile. These students improved by 20 percentage points from 43% of students making gains in 2018 to 63% of students making learning gains in 2019.

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

Performance of students with disabilities is the lowest performing subgroup overall. African American students science proficiency is a concern.

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

1. Increasing science achievement scores school wide.
2. Improving science achievement (proficiency) for subgroups that performed significantly lower than their counterparts (Students with Disabilities and African American students).
3. Increasing the number of students achieving learning gains in English Language Arts (ELA) school wide.
4. Improving English Language Arts achievement (proficiency) for subgroups that performed significantly lower than their counterparts (Students with Disabilities and

African American students).

5. Improving Math achievement (proficiency) for subgroups that performed significantly lower than their counterparts (Students with Disabilities and African American students).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Percentage of students achieving reading proficiency
Rationale	There is a need for differentiated instruction for struggling readers as well as to motivate and challenge students who understand and master benchmarks in lessons taught (particularly for informational text).
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	84% of our students will score a level 3 or above in reading as measured by the 2020 FSA ELA Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated instruction with ongoing progress monitoring will be offered in reading classes to ensure student needs are being met. Teachers that consistently and adequately differentiate instruction coupled with ongoing progress monitoring:
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledge student diversity, 2. Design lessons around patterns of student need, 3. Create whole-group, small group, and individual tasks based on content and student needs. 4. Enhance, by formal and informal assessments that gauge impact of teacher decisions, meaningful, data driven instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement iReady for all students. 2. Utilize reading assessment data to inform instruction. 3. Implement 3-Tier Model of Response to Instruction (Rtl) Problem Solving Team with emphasis on differentiated reading instruction. 4. Weekly triage meetings (principal, assistant principal, math coach, reading coach, and guidance counselor/referral coordinator) to monitor student progress and support teachers' needs in the classroom. 5. Develop Personal Education Plans (PEP) for students whose reading skills are below grade level and notify parents of at-risk students. 6. Provide enrichment/challenging activities to students within the classroom. 7. Provide professional development and support in reading instruction. 8. Intensive reading interventions during the school day. 9/ Implement small group and differentiated instruction for reading during reading block.
Person Responsible	Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)

#2	
Title	Percentage of students in bottom quartile (lowest 25%) making learning gains in reading
Rationale	Students that are not making progress based upon Tier 2 instruction are not being identified and provided Tier 3 instruction consistently.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	66% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains as measured by the 2020 FSA ELA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated instruction with ongoing progress monitoring will be offered in reading classes to ensure student needs are being met. Teachers that consistently and adequately differentiate instruction coupled with ongoing progress monitoring:
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledge student diversity, 2. Design lessons around patterns of student need, 3. Create whole-group, small group, and individual tasks based on content and student needs. 4. Enhance, by formal and informal assessments that gauge impact of teacher decisions, meaningful, data driven instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess students using grade level and below grade level assessments. Match instructional materials used in small group and intervention block time to specific needs as identified in assessments. 2. Utilize iReady Reading 3. Implement small group and differentiated instruction for reading during reading block. 4. Weekly triage meetings (principal, assistant principal, reading coach, math coach, and guidance counselor/referral coordinator) to monitor student progress and support teachers' needs in the classroom. 5. Utilize reading assessment data to inform instruction. 6. Use of technology with STAR, AR, iReady, and AIMSWEB Plus to drive instruction and enhance decision-making. 7. Resources available to teachers-AR/STAR, iReady and Florida Ready, Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention classes, Reading buddies, Wonders Program with Intervention support. 8. Provide Professional Development and support in reading instruction.
Person Responsible	Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)

#3	
Title	Percentage of students achieving math proficiency
Rationale	The need to meet the needs of struggling math students, particularly in the area of number sense.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	86% of students will score a level 3 or above in math as measured by the 2020 FSA Math assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated instruction with ongoing progress monitoring will be offered in reading classes to ensure student needs are being met. Teachers that consistently and adequately differentiate instruction coupled with ongoing progress monitoring:
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledge student diversity, 2. Design lessons around patterns of student need, 3. Create whole-group, small group, and individual tasks based on content and student needs. 4. Enhance, by formal and informal assessments that gauge impact of teacher decisions, meaningful, data driven instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement iReady (computerized math program) for all students. 2. Utilize STAR Math to identify student progress toward proficiency. 3. Implement 3-Tier Model of Response to Instruction (RtI) Problem Solving Team with emphasis on differentiated math instruction. 4. Weekly triage meetings (principal, assistant principal, math coach, reading coach, and guidance counselor/referral coordinator) to monitor student progress and support teachers' needs in the classroom. 5. Develop Personal Education Plans (PEP) for students whose math skills are below grade level and notify parents of at-risk students. 6. Provide professional development and support in math instruction. 7. Intensive math intervention during the school day. 8. Implement small group and differentiated instruction for math during math block.
Person Responsible	Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)

#4	
Title	Percentage of students in bottom quartile (lowest 25%) making learning gains in math
Rationale	Prior year's learning gains for lowest quartile students in math (63%) slightly lags behind lowest quartile performance in reading (66%). Differentiated instruction is not being aligned to specific needs of students in math. Students that are not making progress, based upon Tier 2 instruction, are not being identified and provided Tier 3 Instruction consistently.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	63% of students in the bottom quartile (lowest 25%) will make learning gains in math as measured by the 2020 FSA Math assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated instruction with ongoing progress monitoring will be offered in reading classes to ensure student needs are being met.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers that consistently and adequately differentiate instruction coupled with ongoing progress monitoring: 1. Acknowledge student diversity, 2. Design lessons around patterns of student need, 3. Create whole-group, small group, and individual tasks based on content and student needs. 4. Enhance, by formal and informal assessments that gauge impact of teacher decisions, meaningful, data driven instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement iReady Utilize STAR Math computerized math program) to identify student progress toward proficiency for all students. 2. Implement 3-Tier Model of Response to Instruction (RtI) Problem Solving Team with emphasis on differentiated math instruction. 3. Weekly triage meetings (principal, assistant principal, math coach, reading coach, and guidance counselor/referral coordinator) to monitor student progress and support teachers' needs in the classroom. 4. Develop Personal Education Plans (PEP) for students whose math skills are below grade level and notify parents of at-risk students. 5. Response to Intervention (RtI) Meetings with support staff for students who are not making sufficient progress or exhibit a need for further evaluation. 6. Provide professional development and support in math instruction. 7. Intensive math intervention during the school day. 8. Utilize the iReady program and iReady Toolbox program for below grade level students and reinforce Florida Standards. 9. Implement small group and differentiated instruction for math during math block. 10. Monitor student progress at all levels using formative (formal and informal) and summative assessments.

Person Responsible Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)

#5

Title Percentage of students achieving science proficiency

Rationale Prior assessment data reveals student performance on the Statewide Science Assessment for Roberts Elementary have been the lowest proficiency levels of the three tested subjects (ELA, Math, and Science). Student proficiency has fluctuated from 76% (2016, 2019), 78% (2017), and 86% (2018).

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve 78% of students will score a level 3 or above in science as measured by the 2020 Statewide Science Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy Differentiated instruction with ongoing progress monitoring will be offered in reading classes to ensure student needs are being met. Teachers may use instructional materials that match the reading levels of diverse learners to ensure students understand core concepts and big ideas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Teachers that consistently and adequately differentiate instruction coupled with ongoing progress monitoring:
 1. Acknowledge student diversity,
 2. Design lessons around patterns of student need,
 3. Create whole-group, small group, and individual tasks based on content and student needs.
 4. Enhance, by formal and informal assessments that gauge impact of teacher decisions, meaningful, data driven instruction.

Action Step

Description 1. Implement science instruction from core text for all grade levels K-5.
 2. Provide professional development and support in science instruction.
 3. Provide enrichment, challenging, and hands on science instruction to students within the classroom.
 4. Monitor student progress at all levels using formative (formal and informal) and summative assessments including district progress monitoring tools for 3rd-5th grade.
 5. Disaggregate science data from previous years' Statewide Science Assessment (2016-2019) to determine data trends, strengths and challenges by assessment categories (Nature of Science, Earth and Space Science, Physical Science, and Life Science).

Person Responsible Kim McFarland (mcfarlandk2@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

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

- * Teachers send "Positive Postcards" periodically to connect with families.
- * Teachers communicate with families through newsletters, websites, Dojo, phone calls, and conferences.
- * Families are provided information through listserv, the school website, and social media.
- * A Curriculum Night is held in the fall and student conferences in the spring.
- * Families are encouraged to attend PTO meetings and to participate in other activities and events throughout the year.
- * Parents are kept informed of their child's progress through FOCUS, Accelerated Reader Home Connect, and Dojo.
- * We involve parents/guardians/family and supporters in activities that celebrate and enhance student and school success through positive and effective relationship with our PTO, SAC, Mentorship Program, and Volunteer Program.
- * Students will lead a conference with their parents using their progress monitoring notebooks in the spring.

Additional activities implemented to build positive relationships with families, parents, and other community stakeholders are as follows:

- * During Open House, curriculum night, etc. ensure non-threatening methods of introducing parents to teachers and administrators
- * Teachers communicate with families through newsletters, websites, phone calls, and conferences
- * Families are provided information through listserv, school website, and social media
- * Parents are kept informed of their child's progress through FOCUS and Accelerated Reader

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

- * A differentiated system of school counseling services is in place providing dedicated time for the core classroom guidance instruction on developing and implementing behavior standards.

- * Individual and group counseling for students is available as needed.
- * Selected students are provided additional support through the Mentor Program, the Reading Pals Program, and Project R.E.A.D.

Additionally, the school utilizes its guidance counselor and MTSS team to ensure that all students' social emotional needs are being met, and works with teachers to implement strategies to provide an appropriate learning environment.

We offer a mentoring program which pairs eligible students with community members who take an interest in their well-being and support them academically by reading with them and supporting them through classwork and homework. Counseling services are provided by our school Guidance Counselor when appropriate. We also utilize our school social worker, school psychologist and other community resources when necessary to assist students who are struggling in various capacities

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

1. The PK program closely matches that of the beginning of the county's adopted kindergarten curriculum.
2. Progress monitoring, AIMS Web testing, and VPK assessments monitor growth and readiness for success in kindergarten.
3. Sharing a playground with K and being right next to K classrooms allow PK children to become familiar with their future environment and expectations.
4. PK teachers meet with parents at the end of the year to discuss potential concerns regarding kindergarten success and skills to practice over the summer in order to increase school readiness.
5. End of the year IEP meetings for ESE children (with parents, an ESE K teacher, regular K teacher, therapists, and the current PK teacher) create appropriate academic, social/emotional, independent functioning and communication goals to increase success in K.
6. Regular K teachers and the ESE K teacher observe the PK classrooms near the end of the school year to observe learning strengths, ability to attend to and participate in large and small group activities, and discuss strengths/concerns. This allows the current teacher to help make the most appropriate placement with a K teacher who matches each child's needs.
7. There is an orientation during school hours for parents and children to meet K teachers, visit K classrooms, and tour the campus to familiarize future families with the environment and expectations.
8. PK students participate in all activities and events of the school...fire drills, music programs, morning announcements, school-wide activities (Boosterthon, Fall Festival, Silent Auction, PTO, book character dress up, etc.)
9. Articulation meetings are held with feeder middle schools to prepare students for transition.

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 SLT works as a cohesive team to make decisions that directly affect our school body. When there are budget items that need to be addressed as a leadership team, they are presented and voted on at our monthly meetings. If issues occur that need a quicker

turnaround, the principal sends the information out via email and asks for votes to be returned promptly. The meetings are scheduled on a monthly basis and items for discussion are emailed to the executive secretary. Another informative way we share and disseminate the voting process is through Survey Monkey, an online data collecting tool. This is especially useful for items that need school-wide input. The data collected from these surveys is kept on file for five years.

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

Only required for secondary schools. Not applicable for Roberts Elementary School.

Part V: Budget						
1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Percentage of students achieving reading proficiency				\$1,310.40
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1171 - Roberts Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,310.40
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Percentage of students in bottom quartile (lowest 25%) making learning gains in reading				\$1,310.40
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1171 - Roberts Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,310.40
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Percentage of students achieving math proficiency				\$1,310.40
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1171 - Roberts Elementary School			\$1,310.40
			1171 - Roberts Elementary School			\$0.00
4	III.A	Areas of Focus: Percentage of students in bottom quartile (lowest 25%) making learning gains in math				\$1,310.40
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1171 - Roberts Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,310.40
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: Percentage of students achieving science proficiency				\$1,310.40
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

Leon - 1171 - Roberts Elementary School - 2019-20 SIP

	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1171 - Roberts Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,310.40
Total:						\$6,552.00