Kimball Wiles Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Kimball Wiles Elementary School

4601 SW 75TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32608

https://www.sbac.edu/wiles

Demographics

Principal: Katherine Munn   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
2019-20 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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

Kimball Wiles Elementary School

4601 SW 75TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32608

https://www.sbac.edu/wiles

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	60%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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.

District: We are committed to the Success of Every Student!
School: The mission of Kimball Wiles Elementary School is to provide each student with the best opportunity to learn and thrive each day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

District: We will graduate students who have the knowledge, skill, and personal character to be lifelong learners and independent thinkers. Our graduates will excel in their chosen careers and be productive and contributing members of the global community.
School: Through a unified effort, Kimball Wiles will provide a cooperative, secure and innovative environment in which all individuals will reach their full potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Munn, Katherine	Principal	Provides leadership and promotes the school's vision. Ensures that faculty and staff are trained in all aspects of student learning and performance.
Haukland, Edward	Assistant Principal	Provides guidance to classroom teachers on development of appropriate instructional strategies for individual students. Provides research-based curriculum resources for classroom use. Implements state, district, and school level data collection and assists in data analysis. Assists with the design and implementation of intervention plans.
Cox, Tracy	Instructional Coach	Collects student data and aids in the analysis of classroom and student performances. Provides resources to teachers regarding best practices for instruction. Maintains records for Title 1. Provides training for Title 1, ESE, and Intervention teachers.
Polvere, Stacey	Dean	Develops and implements school-wide Student Behavior including Functional Behavior Assessments and Behavior Improvement Plans. Maintains records of behavior issues and resolutions.
Kranzler, Theresa	School Counselor	Monitors implementation of IEPs and 504 plans. Provides guidance to students needing assistance.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Katherine Munn

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
9

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
2019-20 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)

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.	

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	120	133	136	113	144	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	762
Attendance below 90 percent	3	9	16	20	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	2	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	161	159	167	167	129	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	924
Attendance below 90 percent	3	9	16	20	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	15	7	11	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	2	3	3	9	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	1	3	13	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	
Number of students enrolled	161	159	167	167	129	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	924
Attendance below 90 percent	3	9	16	20	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	15	7	11	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	2	3	3	9	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	1	3	13	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	72%	59%	57%	71%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	57%	58%	69%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	49%	53%	50%	48%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	60%	63%	75%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	61%	62%	71%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	49%	51%	52%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	57%	53%	77%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	72%	57%	15%	58%	14%
	2018	74%	56%	18%	57%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	55%	17%	58%	14%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	65%	55%	10%	56%	9%
	2018	64%	55%	9%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	70%	58%	12%	62%	8%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
	2018	72%	60%	12%	62%	10%	
Same Grade Comparison	-2%						
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	77%	60%	17%	64%	13%	
	2018	64%	60%	4%	62%	2%	
Same Grade Comparison	13%						
Cohort Comparison	5%						
05	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%	
	2018	66%	61%	5%	61%	5%	
Same Grade Comparison	-1%						
Cohort Comparison	1%						

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	64%	55%	9%	53%	11%	
	2018	59%	55%	4%	55%	4%	
Same Grade Comparison	5%						
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	38	41		41	50	42					
ELL	75	64		79	81						
ASN	92	76		95	83		83				
BLK	40	43	35	39	56	45	27				
HSP	71	62		65	55	46	33				
MUL	86	100		90	81						
WHT	80	70	48	80	64	37	84				
FRL	54	55	35	48	51	40	36				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	38	39	29	31	29	20	29				
ELL	38	69		63	77						
ASN	87	76		98	93		88				
BLK	42	36	27	35	36	19	27				
HSP	67	47	55	69	56		67				
MUL	72	37		77	58		64				
WHT	74	44	45	78	58	53	76				

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
FRL	55	38	31	53	45	23	47				

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	16	36	35	16	27	12					
ELL	50			75							
ASN	90	86		98	89		94				
BLK	39	52	35	44	49	31	53				
HSP	65	68		72	79	70	79				
MUL	75	88		79	76						
WHT	82	69	69	84	73	68	78				
FRL	50	67	53	51	57	49	45				

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	62
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	496
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	74
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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

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%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
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	58
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	89
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	66
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

The area needing the most attention is the Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math. All school grade components showed an increase over the previous year, however the lowest quartile remained below the district and state average, even though both components showed growth. One contributing factor for such performance could be the lack of consistent resources being used in tutoring, Title 1, and in-class small group instruction. With the addition of the SIPPS program, we hope to reduce the impact of such a factor.

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

All same-grade comparisons recorded growth in all areas. Reductions in performances were recorded among the cohort comparison levels and consistent within the 3rd grade cohort (reduction of 2%). One factor could be the addition of newer teachers to the 3rd grade team.

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.

All components were above the state average, with the exceptions of the Lowest Quartile in ELA (-10%) and Math (-7%). Factors that played a part were outlined in section 1a.

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

4th grade recorded an increase by 15% in ELA as compared to the previous year. We feel that additional Data Chats played an integral role, as teachers were given increased opportunities to analyze student performance more consistently.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Last year, 4th grade recorded the highest number of incidents that required intervention, and we have implemented measures to build relationships (G.E.N.T.S.) with students and have provided resources to teachers (behavior incentives, monitoring charts) to improve student performance.

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

1. Reducing the academic achievement gap in grades 3-5, as measured by the FSA.
2. Increasing academic performance of the Lowest Quartile in ELA, as measured by the FSA.
3. Increasing academic performance of the Lowest Quartile in Math, as measured by the FSA.
4. Increasing academic performance of 3rd grade in ELA, as measured by the FSA.
5. Reduce the number of out of school suspensions for African American students by at least 15%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By providing training in UDL instructional practices, teachers will gain a better understanding of how to reach students of all abilities with an emphasis on students who are struggling academically.
Measurable Outcome:	To coincide with district goals, Wiles will: Increase student achievement of the Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math by at least 3 percentage points; and Reduce the achievement gap in all curricular areas by at least 3 percentage points in ELA and Math
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Edward Haukland (hauklaea@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	UDL training will be provided as part of Wiles' Professional Development opportunities given throughout the year. Multiple staff meetings will coincide with support from administration as well as compliance monitoring at defined intervals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	"UDL is based on foundational research within the neurosciences, developmental psychology, and learning differences (Rose & Gravel, 2010). This research has suggested that to accomplish effective instructional planning, teachers should consider how to integrate three principles into their instruction and assessment practices that are based on three interrelated types of brain networks (i.e., recognition, strategic, and affective networks). Considering teaching and learning through these three brain networks provides a framework for planning instruction for diverse learners (T. E. Hall, Meyer, & Rose, 2012)." Israel, Maya, et al. "Universal Design for Learning: Recommendations for Teacher Preparation and Professional Development." Innovation Configuration, IC-7, June 2014, http://ceedar.education.ufl.edu/wp-content/ uploads/2014/ 08/IC-7_FINAL_08-27-14.pdf.

Action Steps to Implement

1. UDL Training provided to specific teachers to become trainers for remainder of staff.
2. Faculty UDL overview provided to all staff.
3. Trainers will provide specific training to individual grade levels.
4. Admin will monitor compliance and participation in UDL.

Person Responsible	Katherine Munn (munnkl@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The remaining priorities will be addressed though our numerous intervention services. We will continue to provide small group academic intervention (Title 1) in Reading, After school tutoring (Reading and Math), parent/volunteer reading assistance (Power Reading program), and our G.E.N.T.S. program (BRT/SRO coordination).

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Wiles has a community of caring individuals who work to create an environment where every student is successful. The PTA has numerous outreach programs which emphasize diversity and support instructional integrity. From the Diversity committee to the Teacher Mini-grant support system, Wiles PTA encourages community involvement. Wiles also works with community leaders and its members through the School Advisory Council. This group meets regularly to discuss student achievement and community involvement. In addition, Mrs. Munn, the school principal, communicates through her weekly newsletters and phone-home messages where she emphasizes school readiness and academic success behaviors for parents and their students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				$294,771.60
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School	Title, I Part A	3.0	$234,863.28
		Notes: Salaries for Title 1 Staff				
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$1,960.32
		Notes: Lead Teacher Stipend				
	5100	621-Audio Visual Materials Capitalized	0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$899.50
		Notes: Head phones				
	6300	690-Computer Software	0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$6,646.00
		Notes: Achieve 3000				
	6300	690-Computer Software	0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$2,636.00

			Notes: Reflex Math			
	6300	520-Textbooks	0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$8,800.00
			Notes: Ready Florida			
	6300	500-Materials and Supplies	0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$664.64
			Notes: Educational Games			
	6000	520-Textbooks	0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School			$532.00
			Notes: Universal Design for Learning PLC. Textbooks for new teachers to Wiles.			
	5900	120-Classroom Teachers	0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$11,000.00
			Notes: EDI teacher salaries			
			0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School			$7,662.60
			Notes: Top Score Writing			
			0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School			$3,564.09
			Notes: SRA			
			0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School			$1,870.00
			Notes: Secret Stories Phonics			
			0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School			$13,673.17
			Notes: Additional Supplementary Materials			
					Total:	**$294,771.60**