

Leon County Schools

Killlearn Lakes 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	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Killearn Lakes Elementary School

8037 DEER LK E, Tallahassee, FL 32312

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

Demographics

Principal: Jenny Bla IR

Start Date for this Principal: 9/3/2019

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)	27%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (78%) 2014-15: A (87%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Killearn Lakes Elementary School

8037 DEER LK E, Tallahassee, FL 32312

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

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	No	16%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

School Grades History

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

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 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.

Killearn Lakes Elementary School provides students with an optimal learning environment to create and develop lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Killearn Lakes 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
Wagner, Brenda	Principal	The principal leads the school community in developing, communicating and implementing a vision by emphasizing high expectations for teaching and learning and supporting initiatives to enhance school improvement.
McGrotha, Hank	Assistant Principal	
Mejia, Jan	School 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	14	15	9	11	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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

Tuesday 9/3/2019

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	10	10	8	7	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	10	10	8	7	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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%	86%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	54%	58%	76%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	47%	53%	69%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	84%	64%	63%	87%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	63%	62%	73%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	45%	51%	66%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	52%	53%	80%	51%	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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	14 (10)	15 (10)	9 (8)	11 (7)	11 (11)	12 (17)	72 (63)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (6)	0 (13)	0 (20)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (9)	6 (5)	18 (14)

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	88%	61%	27%	58%	30%
	2018	87%	61%	26%	57%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	57%	24%	58%	23%
	2018	84%	58%	26%	56%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	81%	56%	25%	56%	25%
	2018	85%	57%	28%	55%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	63%	16%	62%	17%
	2018	86%	64%	22%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	66%	24%	64%	26%
	2018	92%	62%	30%	62%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	80%	61%	19%	60%	20%
	2018	85%	58%	27%	61%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	76%	54%	22%	53%	23%
	2018	84%	56%	28%	55%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	45	51	38	52	49	36	38				
ELL	64			82							
ASN	92	78		88	89		85				
BLK	63	67	64	63	53						
HSP	86	62		86	54						
MUL	81	70		88	70						
WHT	85	69	49	85	75	55	79				
FRL	70	60	47	67	61	42	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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	50	54	37	47	47	38	37				
ELL	73			91							
ASN	92	94		88	89						
BLK	60	57		60	71						
HSP	84	69		95	85						
MUL	67	73		56	55						

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
WHT	87	73	61	91	80	76	85				
FRL	68	68	63	68	73	52	71				
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	61	70	63	61	61	55	57				
ELL	86			93							
ASN	94	90		95	100						
BLK	79	68		67	47		60				
HSP	84	54		88	69						
MUL	91			82							
WHT	86	77	68	89	74	72	80				
FRL	76	78	69	76	70	60	68				

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	71
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	496
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	73
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 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	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	62
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	72
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	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
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.

Reading gains of the lowest 25% decreased from 62% to 53% over the previous school year. The previous school year also experienced a decline in this area.

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

Math gains of the lowest 25% decreased from 69% to 57% over the previous school year. The school experienced growth in this area the prior year.

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.

83% of Killearn Lakes students scored a Level 3 or higher in ELA ... compared to the state average of 57% (margin of 26%) represents the biggest gap.

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

Students have traditionally performed well in Math learning gains ...scoring 1st or near the top in this category district wide. Targeted instruction as well as before and after-school tutorial sessions were the greatest factors in learning gains.

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

Attendance (tardies and unexcused absences) would be the primary concern of impacting student performance.

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

1. Math learning gains of the lowest 25%
2. Reading learning gains of the lowest 25%
3. Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Reading Achievement
Rationale	Increase the percentage of students in the lower 25% achieving learning gains in reading.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the learning gains of this group of students to at least 60%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brenda Wagner (wagnerb@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group reading interventions will be offered to students needing additional reading support
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Provide additional reading support before school and after school (LEAP program)
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the lower 25% of learners in ELA 2 Utilize STAR , Aimsweb, and iReady to analyze specific deficiency in Reading 3. Develop reading intervention programs based on needs assessment (comprehension / decoding groups)
Person Responsible	Brenda Wagner (wagnerb@leonschools.net)
#2	
Title	Math Achievement
Rationale	Increase the percentage of students in the lower 25%achieving learning gains in Math.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase learning gains of the lower 25% in Math to at least 60%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brenda Wagner (wagnerb@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group interventions for math students will be offered to students needing additional math support
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Provide additional Math support before school and after school (LEAP program)
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the lower 25% students in Math 2. Students will complete a pre and post assessment 3. 4th/5th grade ESE students will move to an inclusion model for math instruction 4. Level 2 Math students (4th grade) will get additional support in the classroom (Math specialist) to provide support and skill practice for these students.
Person Responsible	Brenda Wagner (wagnerb@leonschools.net)

#3	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	Increase the number of students performing at level 3 or higher on the FCAT Science assessment.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percentage of students performing at Level 3 or above will increase from 76% to 80%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brenda Wagner (wagnerb@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Science will be implemented into the Special area rotation for 5th grade students (students will receive additional support and instruction with Science benchmarks being emphasized) 2.Science will be added into the daily schedule all grade levels for additional 30 minutes of instruction
Person Responsible	Brenda Wagner (wagnerb@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 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.

Killlearn Lakes Elementary will continue to hold parent workshops at the school to increase parent participation and involvement. Our PTO makes connections with parents at Orientation, Open House, monthly meetings, family nights, and various volunteer opportunities. Killlearn Lakes provides information to parents using a variety of methods including website,list serve,social media, monthly newsletters,marquee,student planners,parent conferences and positive phone calls home from the principal.

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.

Killlearn Lakes utilizes a variety of methods to ensure the social-emotional needs of all students are met. We have a comprehensive guidance and counseling program that offers one on one small group and large group guidance sessions. The guidance department works closely with our school social worker to support families and make appropriate referrals in order to provide more extensive counseling support. In addition, KLES supports Holiday giving programs.

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

At Killlearn Lakes Elementary, all incoming Kindergarten students are invited to our annual Kindergarten orientation in May. The orientation consists of a presentation about Kindergarten expectations, PTO opportunities and a tour of the kindergarten classrooms. All participants are encouraged to take part in a pre-placement screening that is administered by our Kindergarten teachers.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The school leadership team through the School Improvement process, the School Advisory Council, and District staffing plan allocations, reviews all available resources in order to meet the needs of our students. Our school and District funds are used to support the goals of the School Improvement Plan as well as providing professional development for teachers and staff. Collaboration and cooperation are essential in providing an instructional program to assist all students to meet the challenge of state standards. Title II funds are used to pay for professional development for our teachers and staff.

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

NA

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading Achievement				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Achievement				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0481 - Killlearn Lakes Elem. School			\$2,000.00
<i>Notes: Accelerated Math</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Achievement				\$2,400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

			0481 - Killearn Lakes Elem. School			\$2,400.00	
			<i>Notes: Science Lab materials</i>				
						Total:	\$4,400.00