

The School District of Palm Beach County

# Glade View Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>25</b> |

# Glade View Elementary School

1100 SW AVENUE G, Belle Glade, FL 33430

<https://gves.palmbeachschools.org>

## Demographics

**Principal: Shundra Dowers**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2020

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (42%)<br>2017-18: F (27%)<br>2016-17: C (52%)<br>2015-16: C (42%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>25</b> |

## Glade View Elementary School

1100 SW AVENUE G, Belle Glade, FL 33430

<https://gves.palmbeachschools.org>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 99%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 99%  |

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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.**

Glade View Elementary Visual, Performing, and Communication Arts School is committed to providing a quality education with excellence and equity empowering every student to reach his or her maximum potential with the most effective staff to cultivate the knowledge, skills, and ethics necessary for academic achievement, responsible and productive citizens.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Glade View Elementary School foresees a dynamic collaborative multi-cultural community where education and learning are respected and supported and all learners attain their maximum potential and succeed in the global economy.

### 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   |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Dowers, Shundra      | Principal           | Administration: Provides initial and continuing professional development opportunities, provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, leads effort to create infrastructure for school-wide implementation of RTI procedures, communicates with parents regarding school-based RTI plans and activities, provides necessary technology, materials, resources, and professional development to staff, ensures the fidelity of RTI implementation through routine scheduling, periodic observation, and discussion with RTI Leadership Team and school staff. |
| Richardson, Anita    | Assistant Principal | Administration: Provides initial and continuing professional development opportunities, provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, leads effort to create infrastructure for school-wide implementation of RTI procedures, communicates with parents regarding school-based RTI plans and activities, provides necessary technology, materials, resources, and professional development to staff, ensures the fidelity of RTI implementation through routine scheduling, periodic observation, and discussion with RTI Leadership Team and school staff. |
| freeman, jackie      | Teacher, ESE        | Assists in identifying appropriate evidence-based intervention strategies, monitors implementation of accommodations, provides SWD professional development to school staff, assists in data collection, data analysis, and progress monitoring.  |
| Livingston, Gretchen | Instructional Coach | Assists in identifying appropriate evidence-based interventions strategies, assists with whole school screening programs to identify students who may be considered "at risk", provides professional development to school staff, assists in data collection, data analysis, and progress monitoring.   |
| McKinney, Cathie     | Instructional Coach | Reading Coach to support improvement of instruction with all teachers in K-5. Focus will be to utilize research-based strategies to solidify student learning gains & proficiency.  |
| Arnett, Ronelda      | Teacher, K-12       | Math teacher who will strategically work with the Math Coach to create & execute a Math plan to support instruction of all students, specifically K-2 to ensure future success.   |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Monday 6/8/2020, Shundra Dowers

**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.*

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

28

### Demographic Data

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (42%)<br>2017-18: F (27%)<br>2016-17: C (52%)<br>2015-16: C (42%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

### 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               | 25          | 49 | 49 | 39 | 48 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 260   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 34 | 26 | 25 | 31 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 148   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 9           | 8  | 27 | 18 | 34 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 117   |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 4  | 22 | 18 | 11 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 78    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3  | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| FY20 ELA Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2         | 0           | 0  | 0  | 41 | 37 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 114   |
| FY20 Math Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2        | 0           | 0  | 0  | 30 | 33 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 94    |

**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           | 9 | 22 | 20 | 28 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 107   |

**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 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 6/10/2020

**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     | 48          | 47 | 39 | 46 | 53 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 282   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 16          | 10 | 0  | 14 | 11 | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 19 | 17 | 5  | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 58    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 13          | 23 | 32 | 38 | 32 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 180   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 35 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 77    |

**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           | 6 | 21 | 34 | 24 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 128   |

#### 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           | 3 | 2 | 7 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |

#### 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     | 48          | 47 | 39 | 46 | 53 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 282   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 16          | 10 | 0  | 14 | 11 | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 19 | 17 | 5  | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 58    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 13          | 23 | 32 | 38 | 32 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 180   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 35 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 77    |

#### 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           | 6 | 21 | 34 | 24 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 128   |

#### 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           | 3 | 2 | 7 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |

## 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            | 29%    | 58%      | 57%   | 42%    | 53%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains         | 55%    | 63%      | 58%   | 74%    | 59%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 54%    | 56%      | 53%   | 59%    | 55%      | 52%   |

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Achievement            | 28%    | 68%      | 63%   | 35%    | 62%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 59%    | 68%      | 62%   | 48%    | 62%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 46%    | 59%      | 51%   | 48%    | 53%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 20%    | 51%      | 53%   | 56%    | 51%      | 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 | 18%    | 54%      | -36%                       | 58%   | -40%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 27%    | 56%      | -29%                       | 57%   | -30%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 45%    | 62%      | -17%                       | 58%   | -13%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 15%    | 58%      | -43%                       | 56%   | -41%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 30%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 18%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 20%    | 59%      | -39%                       | 56%   | -36%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 30%    | 59%      | -29%                       | 55%   | -25%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -10%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 16%    | 65%      | -49%                       | 62%   | -46%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 30%    | 63%      | -33%                       | 62%   | -32%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -14%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 34%    | 67%      | -33%                       | 64%   | -30%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 12%    | 63%      | -51%                       | 62%   | -50%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 22%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 28%    | 65%      | -37%                       | 60%   | -32%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 23%    | 66%      | -43%                       | 61%   | -38%                    |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 16%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 20%    | 51%      | -31%                       | 53%   | -33%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 35%    | 56%      | -21%                       | 55%   | -20%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -15%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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                                       |          | 32     |             |           | 26      |              | 8        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 42       | 70     |             | 42        | 75      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 28       | 56     | 56          | 27        | 58      | 44           | 18       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 29       | 55     | 54          | 28        | 59      | 46           | 20       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 7        | 45     | 50          | 4         | 5       |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 20       | 46     |             | 25        | 38      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 26       | 29     | 48          | 21        | 10      | 17           | 39       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 24       | 30     | 48          | 22        | 9       | 17           | 37       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 7        | 38     | 50          | 7         | 40      | 57           | 10       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       |          | 38     |             | 11        | 31      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 43       | 76     | 63          | 36        | 51      | 55           | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 42       | 74     | 62          | 36        | 48      | 46           | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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 |

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 45   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 69   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 360  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 13   |
| 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                                 | 45   |
| 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   |      |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | N/A  |

| Hispanic Students  |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| 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%                | 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   |     |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 45  |
| 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.**

Science is the lowest performing achievement area at 20%. Math Achievement is the second lowest performing achievement area at 28%. As a grade level group, 3rd grade performance was the lowest at 18% in ELA and 16% in Math.

District Winter Diagnostic Results

ELA

31% students in grades 3, 4 and 5 are predicted to be proficient on FY20 FSA. We were 4 points away from achieving our year's goal of 35% for FY20.

In 3rd-5th we currently have 34 students at Level 3, 9 students at Level 4 and 3 students at Level 5. We currently have 57 Level 1 students who are receiving Supplemental (Tier 2) intervention and small group differentiated instruction within 90 minute reading block (Core Tier 1).

District Winter Diagnostic Results

## MATH

36% of students in grades 3, 4 and 5 are predicted to be proficient on the FY20 FSA. We were 2 points away from achieving our year's goal of 38% for FY20.

In 3rd-5th we currently have students 40 at Level 3, 10 students at Level 4 and 3 students at Level 5. We have 51 Level 1 students.

## SCIENCE

Lvl 3+ an increase to 21.6 (+1.6%)

There is a lack of end of year data due to state-mandated school closure (COVID19) with the cancellation of state assessments; we will continue with our FY20 goals for FY21.

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

Science from 38% to 20%, a decline of 18 percentage points. As a grade level group, 3rd grade ELA declined 9 percentage points, from 27% in 2018 to 18% in 2019; 3rd grade Math declined 14 percentage points, from 30% in 2018 to 16% in 2019.

## Mid year District Winter Diagnostic Results

### ELA

31% students in grades 3, 4 and 5 are predicted to be proficient on FY20 FSA. We were 4 points away from achieving our year's goal of 35% for FY20.

In 3rd-5th we currently have 34 students at Level 3, 9 students at Level 4 and 3 students at Level 5. We currently have 57 Level 1 students who are receiving Supplemental (Tier 2) intervention and small group differentiated instruction within 90 minute reading block (Core Tier 1).

### MATH

36% of students in grades 3, 4 and 5 are predicted to be proficient on the FY20 FSA. We were 2 points away from achieving our year's goal of 38% for FY20.

In 3rd-5th we currently have students 40 at Level 3, 10 students at Level 4 and 3 students at Level 5. We have 51 Level 1 students.

## SCIENCE

Lvl 3+ an increase to 21.6 (+1.6%)

### **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 Math Achievement gap between the school and State is -35% and the gap between the school and the District is -40% points. The ELA Achievement gap between the school and the State -28%. As a grade level group, the gap between the school and State in 3rd grade Math was -35%. As a grade level group, the gap between the school and the District in 3rd grade math was -40%.

From our midyear data, we see GVES is on an upwards trend towards meeting our goals. With strategic planning and data analysis, we plan to make the necessary steps to close the achievement gap.

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

Grade 4 ELA improved 30% from 2018 (15%) to 2019 (45%). Grade 4 Math improved 20% from 2018 (12%) to 2019 (22%). No, this is not a trend but a improvement in ELA and Math in the past three years. The actions and changes that led to improvement in fourth grade were two teachers looped up



with their students from 4th grade(2 years); collaborative planning across grade level and explicit instruction. However, we are also seeing positive growth in Science. These changes can be attributed to strategic planning and organizational focus during our professional learning communities and through the recruitment and retention of certified teachers.

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

Our data trends show that a focus on literacy that includes remediation of standards, foundational skills, while scaffolding instruction that meets the full intent and rigor of standards in all content areas. We will specifically focus on our ESSA identified subgroup; SWD students; who will receive strategic, be targeted support through various modes of instruction, including technology, small group, tutorials, data chats and student monitoring.

1. Course failure within ELA & Math- if students do not successfully learn the standards to meet the grade level criteria in a timely and efficient manner, our student will lose momentum and not be on track towards academic success and future college and career readiness.

Our focus will be to increase learning gains and achievement for all grades in addition to focusing on the needs of our students with disabilities. When we focus on literacy, math and science with remediation of standards, foundational skills, while scaffolding instruction that meets the full intent and rigor of standards in all content areas we will support all learners.

2. Level one on statewide assessments- Our concerns are due to the amount of students scoring level one on the state-wide assessments and how many students are performing 1 to 2 or more years below grade level. This hinders the child's possibility of future exposure to acceleration course which will afford them the opportunity for success in college and careers.

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

1. Improve learning gains and achievement of SWDs.

For two consecutive years, Students with Disabilities have scored below 41% according to the Federal Index. This indicates that we need to provide additional support to help with achievement in all content areas including but not limited to mentoring, tutorials, focused teacher planning/ collaboration & professional development to ensure we meet the needs of all of our students in an equitable and accessible manner.

2. Increase 5th Science Proficiency to 27%.

3. Increase 3rd ELA Proficiency to 28%.

4. Increase Math Proficiency to 38%.

GVES is determined to increase proficiency in all tested content areas with the support of technology and modifications to instruction including, but not limited to research-based strategies, small group differentiated instruction and strategic planning utilizing data to make the necessary changes to support all students all the time. Ensuring personalized instruction and learning for all our students to perform on grade level will positively develop their self esteem, self-worth, and aspirations towards college and career readiness success.

Children who have developed strong reading skills perform better in school and have a healthier self-image. They become lifelong learners and sought-after employees. Lacking basic reading and writing skills is a tremendous disadvantage. Literacy not only enriches an individual's life, but it creates opportunities for people to develop skills that will help them provide for themselves and a better future.

Standards Based Instruction will continue to be a primary focus during instruction planning sessions, professional learning communities and data chats with teachers and students. Resources and strategies will be aligned to grade level standards and scaffolds will be put in place to support

students who are not yet performing at their grade level. All teachers, including elective teachers collaborated to ensure program success. Administrators are assigned to support the students and build relationships with them to motivate and support them as needed.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

## #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Improve student achievement to ensure progress towards meeting the expectations for Strategic Plan Long Term Outcomes (LTO) #1, Increase reading on grade level by 3rd grade, and LTO #2 High school readiness.

GVES improved from an F to a C during FY19, and this improvement must be sustained. The gap between Glade View's 2019 ELA Achievement (29) and the District average (58) is 29%. The gap between its Mathematics Achievement (28) and the District average (68) is 40%. Science Achievement declined 18 points in 2019, reflecting a gap with the District of 31%. ESSA data shows that ESSA Subgroup SWD is performing below the Federal Index at 12% for two consecutive years.

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

District Winter Diagnostic Results  
ELA

31% students in grades 3, 4 and 5 are predicted to be proficient on FY20 FSA. We were 4 points away from achieving our year's goal of 35% for FY20. In 3rd-5th we currently have 34 students at Level 3, 9 students at Level 4 and 3 students at Level 5. We currently have 57 Level 1 students who are receiving Supplemental (Tier 2) intervention and small group differentiated instruction within 90 minute reading block (Core Tier 1).

District Winter Diagnostic Results  
MATH

36% of students in grades 3, 4 and 5 are predicted to be proficient on the FY20 FSA. We were 2 points away from achieving our year's goal of 38% for FY20. In 3rd-5th we currently have students 40 at Level 3, 10 students at Level 4 and 3 students at Level 5. We have 51 Level 1 students.

There is a lack of end of year data due to state-mandated school closure (COVID19) with the cancellation of state assessments; we will continue with our FY20 goals for FY21.

### Measurable Outcome:

Decrease the gap between the current status of ELA and Math Achievement.  
ELA is 35% proficiency, a 6% projected growth and in Math 38%, a 10% projected growth.

- ELA Level 3+: From 29% to 35%, an increase of 6%
- ELA Learning Gains: From 55% to 60%, an increase of 5%
- ELA Low 25: From 54% to 60%, an increase of 6%
- Math Level 3+: From 28% to 38%, an increase of 10%
- Math Learning Gains: From 59% to 65%, an increase of 6%
- Math Low 25: From 46% to 60%, an increase of 14%
- Science Level 3+: From 20% to 27%, an increase of 7%
- Total points earned: From 291 to 345 points
- Percent of points earned: From 42% to 49%, an increase of 7%
- An increase in Learning Gains for our SWD's in all tested content areas.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shundra Dowers (shundra.dowers@palmbeachschools.org)

### Evidence-based Strategy:

(1) Professional Learning Communities - Teachers will engage in focused professional development, coaching, collaborative planning and data analysis to strengthen strategic, standards-based instruction. (TSSSA)

(2) Primary Literacy Instruction – Strategic literacy instruction in Kindergarten-Second to develop foundation level skills for learning to read. (TSSSA)

(3) Personalized Instruction - Research-based, adaptive instruction through iReady Reading and Math Diagnostic and Instruction will establish personalized learning opportunities for all students and inform small group instruction and intervention. (Strategic Plan)

(4) Extended Day/Year Tutorials - will be offered during and afterschool to ensure we close the learning gap for our highest need students, especially focused on SWDs, ELLs, and Migrant students.

(5) Capacity Building: K-2 - Coaches provide tiered support to ensure best practices aligned with effective and relevant instruction through Peer Assistance & Review (PAR). In addition teachers participate Learning Walks 3x per semester to collaboratively learn from each other.

(1) Professional Learning Communities - Developing teachers' instructional expertise through collective, collaborative actions has been shown to influence student outcomes and improve student achievement. Improving teachers' skills in facilitating highly effective instruction through deep, focused professional development, collaborative planning, and data analysis will help accelerate student learning to meet grade level proficiencies.

(2) Primary Literacy Instruction – Strategic literacy instruction in Kindergarten will prepare students for academic success as they progress through the grade levels.

**Rationale  
for  
Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:**

(3) Personalized Instruction - The use of adaptive instruction will help inform teachers' small group instruction ensuring students receive the differentiated supports needed to close the achievement gap.

(4)) Extended Day/Year Tutorials help enhance student learning through the focus of data driven skills and needs. Tutoring can help strengthen subject comprehension, boost confidence, and build important learning skills.

(5) Capacity Building: PAR affords teachers the opportunity for strategic coaching, modeling, planning & organization to support management & strategies towards professional growth. The Learning Walks allow teachers to observe hands-on best practices and methodologies effectively. They collaboratively debrief and provides PDs/ discussion during PLCs.

**Action Steps to Implement**

(1) Professional Learning Communities

a. Develop schedule for teacher collaboration with data driven agenda.

b. Teachers will engage in deep, focused PDs, both grade and academic content specific, to strengthen standards-based instruction and competencies in using instructional tools, programs, and materials effectively.

c. School-based Coaches and Content and PLC/Data Specialists from the District will support teachers in problem-solving and planning data-driven instruction.

d. Teachers will plan specific small group activities for SWDs using adaptive technologies.

e. Coaches will monitor student performance data in collaboration with the classroom teacher. The team will agree to planning interventions and student participation based on the individual needs analysis.

f. School Leadership will monitor implementation of strategies via lesson plan checks, data analysis/chats, and classroom walk-throughs (Coaches & AP).

**Person Responsible** Anita Richardson (anita.richardson@palmbeachschools.org)

(2) Primary Literacy Instruction:

a. The school will utilize materials & resources from Literacy Footprints

b. The Reading Coach and/or other content expert will provide professional development and support in using the Literacy Footprints components with students effectively in collaboration with other curricula and instructional tools.

c. School Leadership and coaches will monitor implementation of strategies via lesson plan checks and classroom walk-throughs.

**Person Responsible** Cathie McKinney (cathie.mckinney@palmbeachschools.org)

(3) Personalized Instruction:

a. The school will gather baseline data by implementing the iReady Reading Diagnostic and Successmaker Math during the month of September.

b. Grade level teams of teachers, guided by the Assistant Principal, Coaches and PLC/Data Specialists from the District will analyze the data to determine targeted instructional needs and determine groups for differentiated instruction and monitoring.

c. The Assistant Principal will track iReady/SuccessMaker student data and provide results to the Principal and teachers to review and analyze.

d. School Leadership will monitor lesson plans, data analysis and conduct walk-throughs during the instructional block.

**Person Responsible** Anita Richardson (anita.richardson@palmbeachschools.org)

(4) Extended Day/Year Tutorials:

a. Employ in-system and out-of-system tutors to provide differentiated support for students, K-5.

b. Students groups are based on data analysis from FY19 FSA scores, FY20 Winter Diagnostics, and all other district provided data. Priority will be given to our most needy population (SWD).

c. Tutors will receive professional development on utilization of test item specifications, unpacking standards, aligning complexity, and implementation/creation of DOK (Depth of Knowledge) question stems to replace teacher-talk with standards-based student accountability.

d. Tutorials will be structured based on content. Students will rotate amongst content expert teachers.

e. Monitoring for tutorials will be through data analysis/chats, lesson plans, and tutorial classroom observations.

**Person Responsible** Anita Richardson (anita.richardson@palmbeachschools.org)

(5) Capacity Building: Coaching/Learning Walks:

Coaching

a. Teacher data is analyzed.

b. Coaches observe teachers during instruction to determine methodology of highest need. Teachers are tiered for support services through coaching continuum.

c. Coach provides feedback & collaborates with teacher to determine plan of action; Coach modeling > Co-Teaching > Teacher execution > Observation > feedback.

Learning Walks:

a. Tiered support based on the grade level.

b. Based on need, teachers collaborate with "model" classroom teachers to observe > debrief > Opportunity for Q&A (clarification).

c. Teachers execute what they have learned from each other.

d. Monitoring occurs through PLC discussions, classroom fidelity walks and data analysis/chats. (Coaches & Administration).

**Person Responsible** Shundra Dowers (shundra.dowers@palmbeachschools.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous task encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 with a focus on reading and writing across all content areas.**

Glade View Elementary provides an environment where school-wide expectations have been established in the areas of academics, behavior and climate. These expectations promote and maintain a single school culture. This begins with the implementation of a School-wide Positive Behavior Plan that outlines what is expected of every adult and student who becomes a member of our campus. Our School-wide Positive Behavior Support Plan is a guide to how we create an environment where students feel safe and respected. Our student success guideline includes the following: Engage Always, Awesome Attitude, Great Minds, Lifelong Learner and Energetic Eagles (EAGLES). School administration reviews the School-wide Positive Behavior Plan with parents, teachers, students and all staff emphasizing the importance of positive student interaction and consistency.

**Action #1:** The school will continue to provide training to the teaching staff, to ensure their compliance and participation in the RTI process, through faculty meetings, schoolwide professional development, PLCs, and data chats.

**Action #2:** Parents of students in the RTI process will be included in conversations to provide information

as to student performance, learning gains. Parents will be informed of student-specific data and systems to support and intervene, in consultation with the RTI team. RTI presentations will be provided during Curriculum Night to provide parents with an overview of the process.

**Action #3:** The school will continue an attendance campaign that employs a rigorous parent outreach component for both general attendance and target interventions. General audiences will receive a generic message on the importance of school attendance via print/letter. A targeted message will be received by parents with students who have missed 11 or more days in the prior year. These messages will demonstrate the effects of absences on student achievement, relative to the student's peers.

In alignment, to school board 2.09 and Florida State statute 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the arts. Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, art expos of different cultures and in music our students study music of different eras and countries and in media our library selection is filled with books related to the variety of cultures and contributions of:

The History of the Holocaust

The History of Black and African Americans

The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics

The Contributions of Women

The Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History.

## 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.

The school will create an absence-monitoring log to track students who miss two, five and ten days of school. The data processor, guidance counselor, teachers and administration will have access to the document to monitor and conduct parental outreach to improve attendance. In addition, the school will continue to implement an attendance campaign that uses outreach and targeted interventions. Creating a centralized document(google doc) to track the absences, parent outreach and target interventions will keep all stakeholders informed and create consistent format for addressing student absences.

Action #1: The school will continue to provide training to the teaching staff, to ensure their compliance and participation in the RTI process, through faculty meetings, schoolwide professional development, PLCs, and data chats.

Action #2: Parents of students in the RTI process will be included in conversations to provide information as to student performance, learning gains. Parents will be informed of student-specific data and systems to support and intervene, in consultation with the RTI team. RTI presentations will be provided during Curriculum Night to provide parents with an overview of the process.

Action #3: The school will continue an attendance campaign that employs a rigorous parent outreach component for both general attendance and target interventions. General audiences will receive a generic message on the importance of school attendance via print/letter. A targeted message will be received by parents with students who have missed 11 or more days in the prior year. These messages will demonstrate the effects of absences on student achievement, relative to the student's peers.

GVE provides an environment where school-wide single school culture expectations have been established in the areas of academics, behavior and climate. This begins with the implementation of a SwPBS that outlines what is expected of every adult and student who becomes a member our campus. Our SwPBS guides how we create an environment where students feel safe and respected. Our student success guideline includes the following: Engage Always, Awesome Attitude, Great Minds, Lifelong Learner and Energetic Eagles (EAGLES).

#### PARENT ACADEMIC TRAININGS (PAT)

The school will continue to implement Parent Academic Trainings (PAT) to share strategies for improving student achievement in math and reading that parents can implement at home with their children. This parent engagement programs allow families to actively engage in their children's education. The trainings help give parents gain the knowledge and skills necessary to support, not just their children's academic and social achievement, but the academic and social well-being of the school and community.

#### PARENT LIASION

We employ a Parent Liaison. The Liaison assists in organization and implementation of family involvement activities; work collaboratively with the schools, parents, community and the District; provide information and materials to families; provide assistance to families in understanding the importance of engagement



and involvement; collaborate with classroom teachers to provide communication with parents; develop and offer presentations at meetings and informational workshops; and, make home visits and contact families to encourage family involvement.

#### 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.

|               |               |  |   |                          |       |                 |
|---------------|---------------|--|---|--------------------------|-------|-----------------|
| <b>1</b>      | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities</b> |   |                          |       | <b>\$308.00</b> |
|               | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus  | Funding Source           | FTE   | 2020-21         |
|               | 5000          | 120-Classroom Teachers   | 1251 - Glade View Elementary School   | School Improvement Funds | 280.3 | \$308.00        |
|               |               |  | <i>Notes: School Improvement Funds will be utilized for a program or process towards student achievement approved by SAC.</i> |                          |       |                 |
| <b>Total:</b> |               |  |   |                          |       | <b>\$308.00</b> |