

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Earlington Heights Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Earlington Heights Elementary School

4750 NW 22ND AVE, Miami, FL 33142

<http://earlingtonheightselem.dadeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Jackson Nicolas

Start Date for this Principal: 7/7/2016

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 below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: F (31%) 2014-15: F (26%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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 Dade 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Earlington Heights Elementary School

4750 NW 22ND AVE, Miami, FL 33142

<http://earlingtonheightselem.dadeschools.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	98%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	100%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	D	A	B	F

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The staff, parents, and community of Earlington Heights Elementary School believe all students have the right and ability to learn. We are committed to providing a solid educational foundation for our students so they may achieve their highest academic potential, while maintaining steady, positive growth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All stakeholders of Earlington Heights Elementary School envision a learning environment that nurtures and encourages students to achieve their full potential as life-long learners who become productive citizens and leaders.

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
Nicolas, Jackson	Principal	As the school's principal, Mr. Nicolas provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Mr. Nicolas establishes high expectations for all students, and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS).
Clayton, Tequila	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Ms. Clayton works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. Ms. Clayton ensures fidelity of the MTSS monitoring by evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development with faculty needs.
Ramontal, Shallynn	Instructional Coach	As the reading coach, Ms. Medina provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Medina utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.
Javier, Estephany	Instructional Coach	As the math coach, Ms. Javier provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Javier utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.
Jhones, Lindsey	Instructional Coach	As the science coach, Ms. Jhones provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Jhones utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidence-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.

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	94	86	77	77	79	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	502
Attendance below 90 percent	28	23	16	12	29	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	2	10	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	19	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	7	3	5	3	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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

28

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

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	26	19	17	23	17	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	8	5	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	1	3	24	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	41%	62%	57%	29%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	41%	62%	58%	63%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	58%	53%	83%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	52%	69%	63%	66%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	40%	66%	62%	77%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	55%	51%	76%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	18%	55%	53%	30%	52%	51%

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	94 (0)	86 (0)	77 (0)	77 (0)	79 (0)	89 (0)	502 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	28 ()	23 ()	16 ()	12 ()	29 ()	11 ()	119 (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 ()	1 (0)	2 (0)	10 (0)	7 (0)	8 (0)	28 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	17 (0)	19 (0)	34 (0)	70 (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	49%	60%	-11%	58%	-9%
	2018	41%	61%	-20%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	64%	-23%	58%	-17%
	2018	32%	60%	-28%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	31%	60%	-29%	56%	-25%
	2018	28%	59%	-31%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	67%	-4%	62%	1%
	2018	68%	67%	1%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	69%	-10%	64%	-5%
	2018	66%	68%	-2%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	35%	65%	-30%	60%	-25%
	2018	70%	66%	4%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-35%				
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	21%	53%	-32%	53%	-32%
	2018	39%	56%	-17%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	26	41	38	21		6				
ELL	57	58		67	58						
BLK	37	38	41	47	38	40	13				
HSP	51	51	60	63	47		38				
FRL	41	41	46	52	40	41	18				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	52	73	85	93	100	9				
ELL	54	67		79	55						
BLK	33	49	71	72	73	81	44				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
HSP	49	48		89	62		50				
FRL	37	49	70	76	70	83	45				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	12	69	76	49	79	90	6				
ELL	24	58		76	67						
BLK	28	64	88	64	79	81	27				
HSP	34	65		78	78		45				
FRL	28	63	83	65	78	76	29				

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Science. Possible contributing factors for the low performance in this area is that students were not meeting proficiency on various Topic Assessments. Remediation of these benchmarks were not monitored utilizing a Data Tracker.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Math L25%. During the 2018-2019 school year, a novice math teacher instructed the entire 5th grade. The teacher struggled with learning the content and managing the students. Despite the support the teacher was given, the students continued to struggle with the content.

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 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Science. Possible contributing factors for the low performance in this area is that students were not meeting proficiency on various Topic Assessments. Remediation of these benchmarks were not monitored utilizing a Data Tracker. The teachers are in need of support in effective Science instruction.

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

Reading proficiency showed the most improvement. Whole group instruction was closely monitored through Coaching Cycles and Instructional Walk-throughs. Teacher peer observations were implemented to share Best Practices.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, student attendance is an area of concern.

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

1. Intervention/RtI
2. Core Academic Proficiency, especially Science
3. Monitoring of Content Areas (Math, Reading, Science)
4. Student and Teacher Attendance
5. Data Driven Instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Interventions
Rationale	<p>According to the FSA 2018-2019 data, the lowest 25% percentage of math and ELA students significantly decreased. The lowest 25% of math students learning gains decreased from 84% to 41%. The lowest 25% of ELA student learning gains decreased from 71% to 41%.</p> <p>According to the FCAT Science 2018-2019 data, fifth grade student proficiency significantly decreased from 43% to 19%.</p> <p>According to the FSA 2018-2019 data, the overall learning gains significantly decreased to 42% in math and 41% in ELA as compared to the FSA 2017-2018 data where the math learning gains were 71% and ELA learning gains were 50%</p> <p>In order to sustain increases and improve student outcomes, there is a need to focus on targeted interventions to ensure school improvement.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we successfully address our targeted intervention groups, then the school will have a larger number of students achieving proficiency and making learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Multi-Tiered System of Support
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>According to Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (2019), the integrated instruction and intervention are delivered to students in varying intensities based on student need. "Need-driven" decision-making seeks to ensure that district resources reach the appropriate students at the appropriate levels to accelerate the performance of all students to achieve and/or exceed proficiency. If the lowest 25% percentage of struggling students are not targeted, the achievement gap will increase even more in both math and ELA. Closing this achievement gap earlier will reduce the amount of time needed to remediate deficiencies in reading and math.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide teachers with an opportunity to access and review appropriate curriculum and effective resources. 2. Provide classroom hourly teachers and hourly interventionists for supplemental instructional support that will include various delivery models to improve learning gains through small group instruction during extended learning opportunities before, during, or after the school day, tutorial sessions during Saturday Academy and/or during Spring Recess Camps. 3. Provide supplemental textbooks and teacher's guides in reading & mathematics to support the reteaching of FSA standards during small group instruction by the interventionists and teachers to targeted students to increase learning gains in these subjects.

4. Provide a Science Transformation Coach to improve science proficiency, support school transformation and turnaround efforts, and interventions to ensure school improvement.
5. Provide a Science Transformation Coach to improve science proficiency, support school transformation and turnaround efforts, and interventions to ensure school improvement.
6. Instructional Support and Coaches will maintain classroom collaboration with content area teachers to address student academic needs.

Person Responsible Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

#2	
Title	Science Proficiency
	According to the FCAT Science 2018-2019 data, fifth grade student proficiency significantly decreased from 43% to 19%.
Rationale	This data shows that fifth grade students did not master fifth grade science standards and can lead to deficiency in middle school science standards.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we successfully implement data-driven instruction, then the percentage of students that are mastering standards will increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Data-Driven Decision Making
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to Mertler (2014), data-driven decision making refers to the process by which educators examine assessment data to identify student strengths and deficiencies and apply those findings to their practice. Data-driven decision making is a process embedded in the culture of the school where data is used at every entry level to make informed decisions on what is best for students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will engage in collaborative planning to discuss data trends from multiple assessments to drive instruction. 2. Provide a Science Transformation Coach to improve science proficiency, support school transformation and turnaround efforts, and interventions to ensure school improvement. 3. The Science Transformation Coach will support teachers in effective science instruction by providing coaching support and coaching cycles to improve outcomes for students. 4. Implement targeted interventions utilizing data for a broader group of students and academic plans. 5. Data chats conducted with teacher/student, teacher/Science Coach, and teacher/administration will be observed and feedback will be provided. 6. Data will be visually represented in the classroom via a data wall. 7. Lessons will include opportunities for remediation and intervention based on the data.
Person Responsible	Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.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 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, Â§ 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.

The faculty and staff at Earlington Heights Elementary works rigorously to keep parents informed of their child's academic progress. Parents are provided quarterly progress reports, report cards and participate in parent/teacher conferences. We encourage our parents to volunteer and join the Parent Teacher Association. Additionally, all stakeholders are invited to attend our monthly Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) meetings in which they receive school improvement, data and budget updates, school program information, and other pertinent topics that directly impact student achievement. Parents are invited to school activities such as Open House, monthly 21st Century Afterschool program meetings and various events.

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 Earlington Heights Elementary, the social-emotional needs of all students are being met through a number of different programs and systems. We also partner with Streamline Miami, which strives to improve educational outcomes and build a culture of achievement in Liberty City to ensure all youth graduate from high school college-ready, without the need for remediation. Achieve Miami is also a program we are working with in order to get individual students the support they need from community members to ensure they have positive mentors.

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

Title I Administration assists the school by providing supplemental funds beyond the State of Florida Voluntary Prekindergarten Program (VPK.) Funds are utilized for extended educational support through a full-time, highly qualified teacher and paraprofessional. This enables young children to experience a variety of meaningful learning activities within an environment offering opportunities to explore, create, develop, extend and nurture knowledge through initiatives shared with supportive adults. The Florida VPK Assessment, along with Teaching Strategies Gold, are administered to all pre-kindergarten learners as an initial, mid-year and final diagnostic to guide learning and kindergarten readiness. Once identified, the certified teacher and highly qualified paraprofessional work with low performing students using Scholastic Big Day Curriculum and high/scope strategies, as well as, the Florida Early Learning and Developmental Standards for Four-Year-Olds. Funding to sustain the remediation and diagnostic instruments come from a District Grant. Earlington Heights Elementary offers all families of pre-kindergarten children activities, registration materials and transitional workshops/meetings offering information and guidance for parent assistance with transition to kindergarten.

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 Education Transformation Office (ETO) utilizes funds to provide additional support to Earlington Heights Elementary. Additional funds are used to purchase supplemental materials, to provide incentive pay, intervention and enrichment activities, job-embedded professional development, and targeted interventions and/or enrichment opportunities. Title I funding is utilized to acquire reading and mathematics transformation coaches who have a history of positive student outcomes as teachers. The school receives additional teaching positions to reduce class size and provide additional courses, to address the needs of all students. Additionally, the school utilizes funds for during the day, before and/or after school, on Saturdays, and during Spring Break interventions.

The school's leadership team analyzes all data sources during the Synergy Summer Institute to problem solve and identify essential practices to sustain and improve outcomes. The leadership team meets weekly to discuss the school improvement progress by analyzing student data and adjusts the action steps to adequately meet all students' needs. Additionally, meetings are held to ensure all resources are being maximized and aligned to the progress of the school.

A Data Assessment and Technical Assistance Coordination of Management (DATA/COM) is conducted three times per year at the district level to gain a deeper understanding of the progress the school and make informed decisions that will improve student outcomes. The principal, Superintendent, state, and district personnel collaborate to problem solve and align resources to appropriately support the school. Strategic Planning Meetings are held three times per year for the ETO, Region personnel, and school-site leadership teams to reflect on the implementation of the defined structures and systems to ensure student success. ETO and region personnel analyze qualitative data and the implementation of the school's action plan steps. This allows for collaboration with the school to ensure that all resources are being maximized to accelerate outcomes.

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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Interventions				\$224,857.88
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG	1.57	\$87,210.00
			Notes: Provide classroom hourly teachers and hourly interventionists for supplemental instructional support that will include various delivery models to improve learning gains through small group instruction during extended learning opportunities before, during, or after the school day, tutorial sessions during Saturday Academy and/or during Spring Recess Camps. 5 hourly interventionists for 28 weeks and 4 hourly teachers during Spring Break Academy for 5 days for extended learning opportunities to increase student achievement.			

	5100	210-Retirement	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG		\$8,128.00
			Notes: Provide the required retirement benefit allocation for the hourly teachers.			
	5100	220-Social Security	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG		\$6,672.00
			Notes: Provide the required social security benefit allocation for the hourly teachers.			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG		\$2,311.00
			Notes: Provide the required Workers Compensation benefit allocation for the hourly teachers.			
	5100	510-Supplies	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG		\$7,736.88
			Notes: Provide classroom supplies: Science kits, manipulatives, paper to print worksheets, pens, pencils, dry erase markers and erasers, and consumable workbooks related to instruction.			
	5100	520-Textbooks	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG		\$8,400.00
			Notes: Provide supplemental textbooks and teacher's guides in reading & mathematics to support the reteaching of FSA standards during small group instruction by the interventionists and teachers to targeted students to increase learning gains in these subjects.			
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG		\$22,400.00
			Notes: Provide non-capitalized computer hardware for additional support for students, to improve small group and differentiated instruction to enhance and supplement the development of conceptual meaning and technology based interventions centered on students' needs and further differentiated instruction for individual student learning within the student block.			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG	1.0	\$60,382.00
			Notes: Provide a Science Transformation Coach to improve science proficiency, support school transformation and turnaround efforts, and interventions to ensure school improvement.			
	6400	210-Retirement	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG		\$5,628.00
			Notes: Provide the required retirement benefit allocation for the Science Transformation Coach.			
	6400	220-Social Security	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG		\$4,619.00
			Notes: Provide the required social security benefit allocation for the Science Transformation Coach.			
	6400	230-Group Insurance	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG		\$9,771.00
			Notes: Provide the Group Insurance benefit allocation for the Science Transformation Coach.			
	6400	240-Workers Compensation	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG		\$1,600.00
			Notes: Provide the required Workers Compensation benefit allocation for the Science Transformation Coach.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Proficiency				\$0.00
					Total:	\$224,857.88