Newberry Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Newberry Elementary School

25705 SW 15TH AVE, Newberry, FL 32669

https://www.sbac.edu/newberryelementary

Demographics

Principal: Constance Victoria Mcalhany

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-4
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)	72%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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

Newberry Elementary School

25705 SW 15TH AVE, Newberry, FL 32669

https://www.sbac.edu/newberryelementary

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-4	Yes	68%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

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

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.

Newberry Elementary School and community working together will provide a child-centered learning environment that builds the foundation for successful life-long learners in a global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Newberry Elementary School's faculty and staff strive to nurture the whole child in the areas of social/emotional health and academic excellence to develop real-life skills to navigate their future success.

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
McAlhany, Vicki	Principal	
Sahmel, Lauren	Assistant Principal	
Winkel, Cheryl	Instructional Coach	
Lowry, Heather	Dean	
Sewell, Montana	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/14/2020, Constance Victoria Mcalhany

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.*

2

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-4
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)	72%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: A (63%)

2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	91	113	97	107	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	520
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	8	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	5	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	2	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/14/2020

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	133	110	124	109	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	597
Attendance below 90 percent	3	13	20	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	7	6	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	1	3	3	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	6	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	133	110	124	109	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	597
Attendance below 90 percent	3	13	20	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	7	6	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	1	3	3	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	6	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	55%	59%	57%	56%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	57%	58%	55%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	49%	53%	56%	48%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	60%	63%	60%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	61%	62%	57%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	49%	51%	57%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	57%	53%	0%	55%	51%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)					Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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	57%	57%	0%	58%	-1%
	2018	58%	56%	2%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
	2018	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	58%	-3%	62%	-7%
	2018	62%	60%	2%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	60%	2%	64%	-2%
	2018	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State 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	22	20		24	40	27					

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
ELL											
BLK	29	39	42	29	43	29					
HSP	56	40		72	70						
MUL	50	69		54	77						
WHT	62	47	47	66	67	33					
FRL	44	49	47	43	49	29					

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	20	21		20	37	36					
BLK	27	27	27	31	32	31					
HSP	45	36		52	55						
MUL	67			71							
WHT	65	57	67	71	61	40					
FRL	39	42	41	48	44	33					

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	32	54		15	23						
BLK	24	50		60	68						
HSP	44	69		53	69						
MUL	75			75							
WHT	65	51	50	61	51	56					
FRL	43	54	63	47	53	71					

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	362
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
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	
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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	63
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	54
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	44
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 data component with the lowest performance is our subgroup of students with disabilities. Based on trends we recognize that scheduling challenges and level of proficiency of teachers in delivering standards based instruction with a UDL approach to meet the needs of individual students.

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

The number of points needed for students to make gains in ELA and math declined from the prior year. Factors that contributed to this decline include level of proficiency among teachers in delivering standards based instruction with a UDL approach to meet the needs of individual students. Also, teaching at a level that matches the complexity of the standard and assessing based on test item specifications.

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 greatest gap in data compared to the state average is our math lowest quartile gains. Cultural responsive teaching and awareness of teachers to build relationships with students and families. Factors that contributed to this decline include level of proficiency among teachers in delivering standards based instruction with a UDL approach to meet the needs of individual students.

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

Math learning gains showed the most improvement from the previous year. Teachers facilitated daily targeted small group math instruction.

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

Our greatest are of concern is attendance. Geographically, our school is located in a rural community. As a result, many of our families are transient given certain seasons of the year.

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

1. Lowest quartile math
2. Lowest quartile ELA
3. Achievement gap for students with disabilities
4. Achievement gap for students who are black/African American
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Strengthen the foundational skills of literacy to increase math proficiency of students and to close the achievement gap by mastering grade level standards.
Measurable Outcome:	Close our achievement gap for our lowest quartile students by 3% points raised in ELA and math. Because there was no FSA testing or school grades in 2019-20, Newberry Elementary will not have accountability components for gains of the lowest quartile in 2020-21 since our highest grade level is 4th. Therefore, we will focus on student achievement rather that student learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vicki McAlhany (mcalhacv@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Continuous professional development through support from the University of Florida and the James Patterson Literacy Initiative.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strengthen the foundational skills of literacy to increase the proficiency of students and to close the achievement gap.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ongoing professional development through University of Florida and JPLC Trainers
2. Inspirational walks (teachers observing other teachers)
3. Feedback from informal and formal evaluations
4. MTSS/Data Chats yearlong
5. Small group instruction and individual interventions

Person Responsible	Vicki McAlhany (mcalhacv@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Continue the work to close the achievement gap, by raising our pass rate on the FSA by 3% for African American students in ELA and math. One of the greatest achievement gaps in data compared to the state average is our math lowest quartile gains for African American students. Cultural responsive teaching and awareness of teachers to build relationships with students and families. Factors that contributed to this decline include level of proficiency among teachers in delivering standards based instruction with a UDL approach to meet the needs of individual students.
Measurable Outcome:	Raising the proficiency level by 3% in ELA and math through the FSA, to progress toward our goal of meeting or exceeding the ESSA federal index target of 41% for the African-American subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vicki McAlhany (mcalhacv@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Continuous professional development through support from the University of Florida and the James Patterson Literacy Initiative.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on trends we recognize that scheduling challenges and level of proficiency of teachers in delivering standards based instruction with a UDL approach to meet the needs of individual students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ongoing professional development through University of Florida and JPLC Trainers
2. Inspirational walks (teachers observing teachers)
3. Feedback from informal and formal observations
4. MTSS/Data Chat yearlong
5. Small group instruction and individual interventions
6. Strategies to build faculty collective efficacy

Person Responsible	Vicki McAlhany (mcalhacv@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase the level of proficiency and close the achievement gap of students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	Raising the proficiency level by 3% of statewide testing with the FSA, to progress toward our goal of meeting or exceeding the ESSA federal index target of 41% for students with disabilities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vicki McAlhany (mcalhacv@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing strategies that are supported through UDL and the James Patterson Literacy Initiative using UFLI.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our goal is to close the achievement gap and increase the level of proficient readers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development in UDL
2. Support Facilitation Instruction Model
3. MTSS/Data Chats Yearly
4. Informal and formal feedback from Administrators
5. Small group instruction and individual interventions

Person Responsible	Vicki McAlhany (mcalhacv@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School leadership team implements a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) and problem-solving process is consistency used by school personnel to ensure progress in the general education curriculum, across all grades and settings, for all students with and without disabilities.
School-wide our teachers will be utilizing the UDL model to increase the support of our students, extend learning, use effective strategies and increase the cultural competency of our staff to reach all students.

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.

For incoming kindergartners we have "Kindergarten Round Up" that allows students and families to come in prior to the school year starting and get acquainted with our school campus, kindergarten teachers and a kindergarten classroom environment. We also have a small group Meet the Teacher for incoming kindergartners and their families.
For our fourth graders, we openly communicate with Oak View by having transition meeting for students with individual education plans, the school counselor at Newberry shares social emotional needs of students of concern with Oak View's school counselor, and we send home summer materials provided by Oak View in an effort to maintain their summer reading skills.
The school counselor provides social emotional lessons at least four times a year for each class. Every classroom teacher has Safer, Smarter Kids (required) and Sanford Harmony (used as needed) curriculum that teachers can access. There is a school wide socialemotional theme that is addressed with monthly character b traits that students use to build an understanding of empathy. Based on need students have access to small group or individual counseling. The school counselor provides families with resources to ensure social emotional needs are met.
School leadership meets with grade level teachers throughout the school year for MTSS/ data chat meetings that include reviewing ongoing progress monitoring data (fluency, comprehension, vocabulary, sight words, phonics), AIMS assessment data, DIBELS, CORE and SIPPS (data taken for intervention students) to monitor student progress. We use that data to make instructional decisions to best meet the needs of each student. Our Title I funds professional development for teachers for inspirational walks, intervention support and parent training.
The school implements the following parental involvement activities as a means to build the capacity for strong parental and family engagement. These opportunities include workshops for the following areas, "Math and STEM for Home Practice" twice a year, "Teaching Reading Strategies at Home" two times a year, "Blow Away the FSA", "Avoid the Summer Slide" and "Kindergarten Round Up", and Edutone Training two times a year.
PTO meets throughout the year to support our students and teachers through a variety of fundraisers and events.
Our SAC meets four to six times a year and is made up of teachers, community members, parents and staff. All with a vested interest in the continued growth of Newberry Elementary.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction				$266,820.60
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	520-Textbooks	0531 - Newberry Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$6,107.60
			Notes: Read Florida			
	5100		0531 - Newberry Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,000.00
			Notes: Headphones			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0531 - Newberry Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$5,806.00
			Notes: Achieve 3000 web-based program			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0531 - Newberry Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,636.00
			Notes: Reflex Math web-based program			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0531 - Newberry Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$248,180.68
			Notes: Supplemental Personnel			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0531 - Newberry Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,960.32
			Notes: Title I Lead Teacher Supplement			
	5100	310-Professional and Technical Services	0531 - Newberry Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,130.00
			Notes: Substitutes for Class-size reduction unit			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American				$12,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0531 - Newberry Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$12,000.00
			Notes: Extended Day Intervention			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$7,829.40
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100		0531 - Newberry Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$7,829.40
			Notes: Additional resources			
					Total:	$286,650.00