

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Morgan Woods Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Morgan Woods Elementary School

7001 ARMAND DR, Tampa, FL 33634

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Kepa

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Morgan Woods Elementary School

7001 ARMAND DR, Tampa, FL 33634

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	89%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	89%

School Grades History

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

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.

The Morgan Woods Elementary School community will provide opportunities for personal growth and academic success for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Morgan Woods Elementary School will develop individuals who are capable of successfully meeting the challenges of the future.

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
Kepa, Jessica	Principal	
Kurella, Carrie	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Jessica Kepa

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.*

1

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Demographic Data

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

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	76	65	77	69	87	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	456
Attendance below 90 percent	16	5	3	5	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	23	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	27	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/9/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	59	78	72	85	75	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	11	11	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	37	32	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	6	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	5	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	59	78	72	85	75	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	11	11	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	37	32	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	6	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	5	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	45%	52%	57%	48%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	55%	58%	49%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	50%	53%	47%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	43%	54%	63%	46%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	57%	62%	54%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	46%	51%	49%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	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	45%	52%	-7%	58%	-13%
	2018	46%	53%	-7%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
	2018	48%	51%	-3%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	31%	54%	-23%	62%	-31%
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	57%	-12%	64%	-19%
	2018	41%	57%	-16%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	61%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	44%	52%	-8%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	24	37	33	27	48	50	14				
ELL	36	53	62	32	59	61	50				
BLK	31			23							
HSP	45	50	54	43	58	48	55				
WHT	47	36		44	58		31				
FRL	43	46	44	41	57	51	49				
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	9	33	55	18	45	42					
ELL	37	53	56	45	61		23				
BLK	33			17							
HSP	47	64	60	48	68	50	49				
WHT	60	53		52	56						
FRL	48	61	57	46	62	44	45				
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	19	32	45	19	27		29				
ELL	33	49	53	31	44	44					
BLK	47			44							
HSP	45	51	52	44	51	52	42				
WHT	53	36		50	64		50				
FRL	44	50	48	42	53	52	45				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
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
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
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	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	
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	43
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	50
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.

In 2019, overall mathematics achievement decreased by 5%, for a total of 43% of students demonstrating proficiency. In addition, the percent of students demonstrating learning gains in ELA dropped 12%, for a total of 43% of students demonstrating gains.

Fall 2019 iReady Winter Diagnostic scores indicated performance below the district average in the percent of students meeting typical growth in 3rd (-3) and 4th (-9) grade reading, and 3rd (-4), 4th (-3) and 5th (-6) grade mathematics.

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

Overall ELA proficiency showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019. During the 17-18 school year, 60% of students demonstrated proficiency. For 18-19, 46% of students were proficient--a decrease of 14%. An increased focus on mathematics instruction during the 17-18 school year may have contributed to this decline in ELA.

Fall 2019 iReady Winter Diagnostic results showed the greatest decline in the number of 4th grade students demonstrating proficiency in mathematics compared with results from the prior school year.

In 2018, 34% of 4th grade students demonstrated proficiency during the Winter Diagnostic window. In 2019, 26% of 4th grade students demonstrated proficiency on the math test--a difference of 12%.

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.

In 2019, 3rd grade mathematics data had the greatest gap when compared to the state average, with the score falling 31% below state average.

During the 2019-2020 school year, students in 4th grade scored 9% below the district average in percent of students meeting typical growth on the iReady Winter Diagnostic for reading.

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

For the 18-19 school year, the learning gains demonstrated in mathematics by students in the bottom quartile increased by 12% to a total of 53% of students demonstrating gains. A large emphasis was placed on this group as a result of the 17-18 data, and additional strategies for improvement were employed. In addition, this group of students received heavy support from the Math Resource Teacher on site.

During the 2019-2020 school year, the percent of 3rd grade students demonstrating proficiency on the iReady Winter Diagnostic for reading was 14% higher than during the prior school year. The Reading Coach worked directly with students in the bottom quartile in small groups to support their individual academic needs.

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

The area of greatest concern is the number of student scoring Level 1 on the statewide assessment (FSA) in Spring 2019.

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

1. Increase overall ELA achievement
2. Increase overall Math achievement
3. Increase the percent of students demonstrating learning gains in ELA
4. Increase the percent of students demonstrating learning gains in Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus for the 2020-2021 school year is to continue creating a culture for teaching and learning. School data indicates a decrease in proficiency and overall gains for both reading and mathematics during the 18-19 school year. A renewed focus on the culture of teaching and learning, specifically related to student engagement and assessment, will lead to an increase in achievement for all learners.

Measurable Outcome: Proficiency for both reading and mathematics will increase to at least 50 of all students scoring Levels 3-5, as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Kepa (jessica.kepa@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will provide high quality standards-based instruction, differentiated to meet the needs of all learners. In addition, formative assessment will be used regularly to drive data-based decision making.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers have previous exposure to unpacking the standards, with two different trainings provided during the 19-20 school year. A continued emphasis on the creation of learning targets and success criteria based on the standards, to include additional professional development opportunities during the 20-21 school year, will ensure that students are presented with the most appropriate instruction to meet their individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide training opportunities for teachers to build knowledge of standards, increasing alignment and rigor. Trainings may be provided by coaches and/or district personnel, and may include professional literature or on/off site opportunities with substitute coverage. Trainings may include but are not limited to: How to Differentiate in the Mixed Ability Classroom (Book Study), Informational and/or Literature Standards (ELA), and Assessment for Learning.

Person Responsible Jessica Kepa (jessica.kepa@hcps.net)

Refine systems for effective lesson planning and preparation by providing clear expectations in support of standards-based instruction. Lesson plans should include evidence of collaborative planning, planning for differentiation and/or small group instruction, and evidence of formative assessment (formal and/or informal assessments planned at regular intervals throughout the instructional block). In addition, teachers will have regular access to instructional coaches to assist with planning for standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible Jessica Kepa (jessica.kepa@hcps.net)

Continue promoting engagement through rigorous instruction by creating strong standards-based objectives, including success/assessment criteria for student reference. Instruction will be differentiated to meet the needs of individual students based on current data, and will include explicit phonics and/or vocabulary instruction. Technology will be incorporated to enhance student engagement through the use of interactive technology, district provided resources, and educational applications.

Person Responsible Jessica Kepa (jessica.kepa@hcps.net)

Establish systems for accountability through ongoing progress monitoring. OPM will be used regularly before, during, and after instruction, with immediate adjustments to instruction being made based on student feedback. Students will be fully aware of the criteria used to evaluate their work, and their progress toward mastery. Teachers will conduct frequent data chats following district and classroom

formative assessments, and will set and revisit goals with individual students. Students will engage in self-assessment as part of this reflection.

Person Responsible Jessica Kepa (jessica.kepa@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school will focus on increasing reading and mathematics achievement for our subgroups falling below the federal index, including those in our SWD and Black subgroups. Students within these subgroups demonstrating a need for support based on historic and/or current data, will be provided targeted small group instruction daily. Small group instruction will be provided by the homeroom teacher AND VE case manager or reading/math resource teacher. Students will be provided additional intervention during the Extended Learning Program (ELP), as well, using district-provided, research-based resources. Student data will be monitored using ongoing formative assessment, and instruction will be modified in response to student progress to ensure continued growth.

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 encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending home flyers, making Parent Link phone calls and/or text message alerts, and posting everything on our website and social media platforms. We focus on communicating every child's progress to their families by engaging parents in parent/teacher conferences quarterly and as needed, and sending home quarterly progress reports. School staff, students, parents, and the school community will work together to develop skills and habits for personal and academic success. We persist at building positive relationships with families and the school community as a whole. Opportunities for participation include, but are not limited to: Meet the Teacher/Open House, SAC, PTA, Newsletters, Website, Edsby, school marquee, Parent Link, quarterly Conference Nights, Volunteer Orientation and Recognition, Academic Family Nights (ELA/STEAM), Committee Events, Great American Teach-In, and 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: Student Engagement				\$204,455.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		100-Salaries	3101 - Morgan Woods Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.5	\$32,235.98
			Notes: The Math Resource Teacher will plan with and provide resources to grade level teams to ensure high quality instruction is provided to all students. Each team will meet with the Resource Teacher weekly, in addition to one PLC per month. The Resource Teacher will target student groups for daily small group support, based on prior scores and current formative assessments, designing targeted support to increase student achievement. Tier 3 students in grades 3-5 will be provided an extra layer of support during the daily intervention block, as well. In addition, the Math Resource Teacher will coach teachers to continue to lift practice.			
		100-Salaries	3101 - Morgan Woods Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.5	\$45,662.31
			Notes: The Science Resource Teacher will plan with and provide resources to grade level teams to ensure high quality instruction is provided to all students. Each team will meet with the Resource Teacher weekly, in addition to one PLC per month. The Resource Teacher will target student groups for daily small group support, based on prior scores and current formative assessments, designing targeted support to increase student achievement. Tier 3 students in grades 3-5 will be provided an extra layer of support during the daily intervention block, as well. In addition, the Science Resource Teacher will coach teachers to continue to lift practice.			
		100-Salaries	3101 - Morgan Woods Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$91,324.63
			Notes: The Reading Resource Teacher will plan with and provide resources to grade level teams to ensure high quality instruction is provided to all students. Each team will meet with the Resource Teacher weekly, in addition to one PLC per month. The Resource Teacher will target student groups for daily small group support, based on prior scores and current formative assessments, designing targeted support to increase student achievement. Tier 3 students in grades 3-5 will be provided an extra layer of support during the daily intervention block, as well. In addition, the Reading Resource Teacher will coach teachers to continue to lift practice.			
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	3101 - Morgan Woods Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$29,232.08
			Notes: Incorporate interactive technology to enhance student engagement through the use of district provided resources and education applications; Presentation Remotes will allow teachers more freedom to move around the room during presentations, allowing increased access to students while using interactive technology for whole and/or small group instruction; Additional laptops to increase access to online platforms used to enhance instruction. Technology may include but is not limited to: Short throw, wall mounted projectors, including the cost of installation; Presentation Remotes; Laptop Computers, including the cost of imaging.			
		239-Other	3101 - Morgan Woods Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00
			Notes: Professional development activities to support high quality reading and/or mathematics instruction may include but are not limited to: Provide training opportunities for teachers to build knowledge of standards, increasing alignment and rigor. Trainings may be provided by coaches and/or district personnel, and may include professional literature or on/offsite opportunities with substitute coverage.			
		500-Materials and Supplies	3101 - Morgan Woods Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00

	<i>Notes: General Consumable Materials such as pencils, notebooks and/or notebook paper, copy and/or chart paper, pens, makers, and other learning materials to enhance instruction for ELA, Science, and Mathematics for Grades K-5</i>
Total:	\$204,455.00