

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Knights 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Knights Elementary School

4815 N KEENE RD, Plant City, FL 33565

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Janine Hall

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2008

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (45%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</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, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Knights Elementary School

4815 N KEENE RD, Plant City, FL 33565

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	82%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.**

Knights Elementary will be an informed, collaborative, community focused together on evidenced based practices which ensure that every student will grow into a successful leader of tomorrow.

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

Knights Elementary will work together as a team to ensure the success of every student.

### 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
Hall, Janine	Principal	Act in the role of instructional leader to facilitate discussion based on school improvement, improved teaching practice and student learning.
Way, Leanne	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 7/1/2008, Janine Hall

**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.*

5

**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.*

4

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

63

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5

<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (45%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</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	102	125	106	111	108	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	16	8	9	7	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	25	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	25	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	25	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	25	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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

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

**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	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Tuesday 6/30/2020

**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	120	121	106	118	102	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	673
Attendance below 90 percent	19	20	13	12	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	30	42	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	42	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	4	8	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

**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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	120	121	106	118	102	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	673
Attendance below 90 percent	19	20	13	12	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	30	42	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	42	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	4	8	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

**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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	49%	52%	57%	54%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	55%	58%	66%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	50%	53%	70%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	54%	63%	54%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	57%	62%	53%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	46%	51%	34%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	50%	53%	47%	48%	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	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
	2018	46%	53%	-7%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	55%	-19%	58%	-22%
	2018	49%	55%	-6%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	54%	8%	62%	0%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	57%	-4%	64%	-11%
	2018	48%	57%	-9%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
	2018	54%	54%	0%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	46%	51%	-5%	53%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	52%	52%	0%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	31	22	31	42	59	55	26				
ELL	30	50	64	45	63	65	18				
BLK	36			45							
HSP	41	53	70	56	71	70	38				
MUL	50			40							
WHT	56	50	67	64	67	71	55				
FRL	44	50	62	54	65	58	42				
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	35	31	47	28	37	47	26				
ELL	22	28	36	36	47	47	11				
HSP	39	39	38	47	47	46	46				
WHT	55	47	38	55	50	35	59				
FRL	44	41	35	46	47	37	46				
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	24	60	68	34	42	50	26				
ELL	25	60	86	38	44	31	25				
HSP	44	65	79	47	52	37	37				
WHT	60	64	56	60	53	35	57				
FRL	49	62	72	49	48	34	39				

**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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
----------------------	--

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Native American Students</b>	
---------------------------------	--

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

<b>Asian Students</b>	
-----------------------	--

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

<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
--	--

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

<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	45
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	61
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	53
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.

Our ELA proficiency was 49% according to 2019 data and formative data was similar at 48% scoring at 50% or higher. Science proficiency for 2019 data was 47% with formative score of 48%. These two areas will be our focus this year. In addition, we will continue to focus on SWD who scored at 38% proficiency according to the previous year's FSA scores. This year's scores were not available.

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

Science achievement decreased by 5%. We have identified the need for a whole school concentration in science exploration and an increase in scientific reading in our ELA blocks.

#### 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.

Our school exceeds the state average in all three areas of math on the 2019 FSA data. Our lowest areas compared to state average are ELA achievement, ELA Learning gains, and science achievement. In ELA achievement and overall gains in reading, we are 8% below the state average.

In science we are 6% below the state average. We have determined that we need to target instruction to meet all of our students' individual needs.

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

In math we increased our Math achievement by 7%, Math learning gains we increased by 17%, Math lowest 25% we increased by 21%. Our teachers spent an increased amount of focused time on reviewing the standards and current levels of our students to create differentiated learning experiences for our learners.

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

The two categories we need to continue to focus on for ESSA are the Students with Disabilities, which is below the 41% cut point and ELL which was under the cut point the previous year but is now above the 41% requirement.

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

1. Create a culture of shared accountability through instruction that is aligned with standards.
2. Differentiated instruction to meet students' individual needs in reading and science with focused attention on students with disabilities subgroup.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

**Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** In order to increase our overall scores in ELA and science, it is necessary to align our instruction with standards.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase graded categories in ELA and science by 5% .

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Janine Hall (janine.hall@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Collaborative planning supported by content coach and leadership team, monthly MTSS meetings to monitor student growth, small group instruction using research based instructional strategies and tools, differentiated professional development with an inquiry focus.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** In order to increase our overall scores it is necessary to align all instruction with standards and professional needs of teachers.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Provide additional intervention groups that build student proficiency levels and learning gains.

**Person Responsible** Janine Hall (janine.hall@hcps.net)

Redefine coaching to include differentiated needs of teachers and peer coaching

**Person Responsible** Leanne Way (leanne.way@hcps.net)

Provide support with a parent involvement liaison to support parent involvement with student learning.

**Person Responsible** Leanne Way (leanne.way@hcps.net)

Monitor progress through PLC data reviews and school wide leadership.

**Person Responsible** Janine Hall (janine.hall@hcps.net)

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]



## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** Differentiated instruction to meet the students' individual needs in reading and science with focused attention on students with disabilities subgroup. We need to improve differentiated instruction to increase proficiency in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:** 55% proficiency in all areas including proficiency in reading for students with disabilities.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Janine Hall (janine.hall@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Collaborative planning supported by content coach, leadership team and peer coaches. Monthly MTSS meeting to monitor student growth. Small group instruction using research-based instructional strategies and tools. Professional development with a focus on differentiation.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** In order to increase our overall scores it is necessary to differentiate instruction based on students' needs.

### Action Steps to Implement

Provide additional intervention groups that build student proficiency levels and learning gains based on differentiated needs of students.

**Person Responsible** Janine Hall (janine.hall@hcps.net)

Increase coaching to include peer coaching as well as continuous instructional coaching sessions with instructional coach.

**Person Responsible** Leanne Way (leanne.way@hcps.net)

Monitor progress through PLC data reviews and school wide leadership.

**Person Responsible** Janine Hall (janine.hall@hcps.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

## 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.

We work to communicate every child's progress to the parents by sending home quarterly progress alerts and holding parent teacher conferences. School staff, parents, students and the community work collaboratively to improve skills and habits for personal and academic success. Our goal is to build positive relationships with families. We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending home newsletters and flyers, utilizing parent link calls and texts and posting on our website and social media platforms. Events throughout the year include Open house, SAC and PTA meetings, Newsletter, website, social media, parent links, conference nights, volunteer orientation and recognition, family nights, Great American Teach-in and ongoing community partnerships.

**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				\$142,884.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2291 - Knights Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$74,600.00
			<i>Notes: Reading coach provides schoolwide PD and individualized coaching with all staff members.</i>			
	6150	150-Aides	2291 - Knights Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$17,019.00
			<i>Notes: Parent liaison to support parent involvement and assistance with Hispanic family needs.</i>			
	6150	510-Supplies	2291 - Knights Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$7,765.00
			<i>Notes: Materials to support daily communication with parents.</i>			
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	2291 - Knights Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: Invest in research based programs to support standards and differentiated instruction.</i>			

	5100	643-Capitalized Hardware and Technology-Related Infrastructure	2291 - Knights Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$33,500.00
			<i>Notes: Replace technology infrastructure by replacing old equipment and purchasing new programs and computers.</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation</b>				<b>\$133,469.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	150-Aides	2291 - Knights Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$17,019.00
			<i>Notes: Kindergarten aide to support early intervention.</i>			
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2291 - Knights Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$95,990.00
			<i>Notes: Tutors will use research based programs to tutor students with specific needs.</i>			
	6400	500-Materials and Supplies	2291 - Knights Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$10,500.00
			<i>Notes: Professional development book studies and opportunities for all staff.</i>			
	5100	692-Computer Software Non-Capitalized	2291 - Knights Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$6,460.00
			<i>Notes: iReady Toolkit supplements learning for all students through differentiation and targeted practice for all students.</i>			
	5100	651-Bus(es)	2291 - Knights Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Field trips to supplement language immersion for transition classrooms.</i>			
	5100	610-Library Books	2291 - Knights Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: Upgrade and replace books in classroom libraries</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$276,353.00</b>