Kingsford Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Kingsford Elementary School

1400 DEAN ST, Mulberry, FL 33860

http://schools.polk-fl.net/kingsford

Demographics

Principal: Cindy Franks

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-06-30
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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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 Polk 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

Kingsford Elementary School

1400 DEAN ST, Mulberry, FL 33860

http://schools.polk-fl.net/kingsford

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	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

At Kingsford Elementary we are committed to providing a diverse, collaborative, high quality education for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kingsford Vision for Rigorous Learning:
Kingsford Elementary provides a positive environment that is challenging and encourages student-led collaboration, high engagement, critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity. We celebrate productive struggle on the way to success!

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Franks, Cindy	Principal	• Conduct regular classroom walkthroughs/observations providing timely feedback, utilizing "coaching notes", district IR tool, and Journey. • Set expectations for teaching and learning for all staff members. • Progress monitor implementation of initiatives across the campus and provide timely feedback. • Meet weekly with the leadership team to discuss progress as it relates to their area of "expertise" and assignments. • Coordinate with appropriate personnel to ensure professional development and support are provided in a timely manner to all staff members.
Hernandez, Clair	Other	• Coordinate testing and compliance monitoring of student's classified for ESOL services. • Maintain running records of students serviced by each member of the ESOL team, including a brief description of the interventions/supports used, problems that arise, progress monitoring of student achievement and progress toward acquisition of the language. • Provide professional development regarding ESOL strategies in the gen ed classroom. • Serve as liaison with families of ESOL students and provide counseling to ESOL students as needed. • Work with small group instruction and additional assignments as needed.
Santangelo, Amy	Assistant Principal	• Conduct regular classroom walkthroughs/observations providing timely feedback, utilizing "coaching notes", district IR tool, and Journey. • Set expectations for teaching and learning for all staff members. • Progress monitor implementation of initiatives across the campus and provide timely feedback. • Meet weekly with the leadership team to discuss progress as it relates to their area of "expertise" and assignments. • Coordinate with appropriate personnel to ensure professional development and support are provided in a timely manner to all staff members. • Coordinate all testing initiatives
Lamb, Ashlee	Instructional Coach	• Meet with grade levels weekly for planning and assist with finding appropriate resources and strategies to support rigorous, standards-based instruction and learning. • Provide appropriate professional development related to building student engagement strategies that are rigorous and standards based. • Build trusting relationships with staff to support the implementation of coaching cycles as identified by administration. • Coordinate and conduct coaching cycles, "instructional rounds", demonstration classrooms, and differentiated support for teachers in all grade levels. • Assist with planning and delivering targeted interventions for students.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Barnhill, Susan	School Counselor	• Collect, monitor, and provide feedback on regularly updated MTSS documentation, and schedule Tier meetings as needed. • Provide differentiated professional development regarding MTSS, as needed. • Maintain accurate records of students requiring social/emotional/ behavioral support. • Provided differentiated support for teachers needing support building a classroom climate for increased student engagement.
Wilbur, Nina	Teacher, K-12	• Both Interventionists have strong backgrounds in ELA, Math and Science, so they will be assigned to support specific grade levels. • Maintain accurate records of interventions provided to students identified as eligible to make learning gains and/or within range to meet proficiency. • Regularly monitor the progress of students utilizing the various data analysis tools. (Performance Matters, I-Station, Freckle, etc.), MTSS documentation, class assignments, interventions, grades, etc. • Collaborate with classroom teachers to ensure that interventions used with students are utilized and reinforced consistently in class and lead to standards mastery.
Warner, Amy	Teacher, K-12	• Both Interventionists have strong backgrounds in ELA, Math and Science, so they will be assigned to support specific grade levels. • Maintain accurate records of interventions provided to students identified as eligible to make learning gains and/or within range to meet proficiency. • Regularly monitor the progress of students utilizing the various data analysis tools. (Performance Matters, I-Station, Freckle, etc.), MTSS documentation, class assignments, interventions, grades, etc. • Collaborate with classroom teachers to ensure that interventions used with students are utilized and reinforced consistently in class and lead to standards mastery.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Cindy Franks

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
44

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-06-30
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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	90	86	120	92	108	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	594
Attendance below 90 percent	0	18	22	15	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	0	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on Dec 2019 STAR - ELA	0	0	1	19	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on Dec 2019 STAR - Math	0	0	20	13	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	3	13	15	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 5/20/2020

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	44	116	83	108	90	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	3	21	14	9	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	8	23	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	35	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	3	1	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	2	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	44	116	83	108	90	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	3	21	14	9	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	8	23	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	35	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	3	1	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	2	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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%	51%	57%	40%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	51%	58%	41%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	49%	53%	43%	50%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	46%	57%	63%	57%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	42%	56%	62%	49%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	47%	51%	40%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	47%	53%	36%	46%	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	42%	52%	-10%	58%	-16%
	2018	40%	51%	-11%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	48%	-12%	58%	-22%
	2018	51%	48%	3%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	43%	47%	-4%	56%	-13%
	2018	41%	50%	-9%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	56%	-5%	62%	-11%
	2018	49%	56%	-7%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	56%	-4%	64%	-12%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	30%	51%	-21%	60%	-30%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	61%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	32%	45%	-13%	53%	-21%
	2018	33%	51%	-18%	55%	-22%
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	16	28	26	22	34	27	25				
ELL	38	41	42	47	35	31	23				
BLK	48	47		30	35		50				
HSP	42	43	40	48	39	34	27				
WHT	54	48	23	47	56	30	53				
FRL	41	42	33	43	39	29	26				
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	13	46	44	24	37	33	8				
ELL	40	58	58	53	45	39	29				
BLK	60	71		39	62						
HSP	42	57	59	56	44	38	34				
WHT	61	57		59	56	36	50				
FRL	44	56	57	52	46	39	34				
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	8	29	40	19	34	37	10				
ELL	27	36	48	52	51	42	17				
BLK	50			50							
HSP	34	42	52	56	53	43	31				
WHT	56	39		61	43	20	42				
FRL	38	44	51	55	50	38	33				

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	350
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
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	42
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	43
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	44
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

The lowest performing component is Learning Gains for bottom quartile in ELA projected at 29%. This is largely contributed to the absence of consistent school-based ELA coach to help with support and planning. Another cause for lower STAR scores would be a spiked number of NES students without additional staff to support their needs. This has not traditionally been our lowest area, but with the mentioned barriers, we are seeing a dip in performance.

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

The greatest decline is in Learning Gains for ELA - projected to be 33%, a drop from 44%. This is largely contributed to the absence of consistent school-based ELA coach to help with support and planning. Another cause for lower STAR scores would be a spiked number of NES students without additional staff to support their needs. In addition, we budgeted for 3 ELA interventionists, but never had any of the positions filled until November, and never more than 2 filled at the same time.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap when compared to state average on 2019 testing is in FCAT science, where we scored 35% proficient and the state average 53% proficient. We traditionally score lower than the state, due to a lack of focus on science in the lower grades, as well as our high migrant population which travels yearly and often misses standards that are only taught in a previous grade. There is also a high correlation between ELA FSA scores and Science scores, where we also see a struggle in performance partly contributing to our students low vocabulary and language skills.

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

We saw the most improvement in Math Proficiency and Math lowest quartile Learning Gains, with a projected 5% increase in both. We contribute this improvement to common assessments, target to task alignments, and consistent small groups with push-in from resource staff.

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

Our top area of concern related to EWS is FSA Level 1 for ELA and Math. However, another area of concern that may be a contributing factor is that 85 students had attendance rates lower than 90%.

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

1. Learning Gains in Grade 5
2. Science Proficiency in Grade 5
3. Increase Proficiency to at least 46% for ESSA Subgroup - Economically Disadvantaged
4. Increase Proficiency to at least 34% for ESSA Subroup - Students with Disabilities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Standards-aligned instruction in each classroom is the basis for effective core instruction. Standards-aligned instruction during core block instruction will help our students work to master grade level standards.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA Targets - Proficiency at 50%, Learning Gains at 49%, Low 25% LG at 40% Math Targets - Proficiency at 51%, Learning Gains at 47%, Low 25% LG at 38% Science Target - Proficiency at 40% Overall School Grade Target - 45% = C
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Santangelo (amy.santangelo@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Planning with the assistance of Academic Coaches will ensure teaching remains aligned to Standards. Additional time will also be provided to plan for Standards-aligned instruction during extended planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Planning with the expertise of Coaches to assist ensures lessons are focused on standards with intended depth and rigor. On the 2019 FSA 45% were proficient in ELA and 46% in Math, along with only 35% proficient on FCAT Science. This demonstrates a need for core instruction tightly aligned with the standards to support more students in achieving mastery of state standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff one Math Coach and two ELA Coaches (one ELA Coach is expected to be on Family Medical Leave until December). These academic coaches will provide support for teachers during lesson planning to ensure target/task alignment with the standards and also provide classroom support to targeted teachers through observations and coaching cycles.

Person Responsible	Cindy Franks (cindy.franks@polk-fl.net)

Pay for extended planning time for teachers.

Person Responsible	Cindy Franks (cindy.franks@polk-fl.net)

Print varied assessments and resource materials to provide supplemental resources and progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible	Amy Santangelo (amy.santangelo@polk-fl.net)

Purchase primary journals for K and 1st grade students to promote development of early writing skills.

Person Responsible	Cindy Franks (cindy.franks@polk-fl.net)

Reading Wonders and Math standards weekly assessments, along with Math module and Science quarterly assessments, will be scanned into Performance Matters and reviewed with teachers and/or grade levels.

Person Responsible	Ashlee Lamb (ashlee.lamb@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will us tools to track mastery of standards during standards aligned instruction

Person Responsible   Cindy Franks (cindy.franks@polk-fl.net)

Use of math manipulatives to improve student understanding of standards will be modeled during planning and monitored during instruction.

Person Responsible   Ashlee Lamb (ashlee.lamb@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Targeted differentiation during both core instruction and small group instruction will help our students fill in learning gaps to enable them to fully master grade level standards. For those who are at mastery level, enhanced learning opportunities will help them broaden their knowledge base by working through rigorous and challenging tasks.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA Targets - Proficiency at 50%, Learning Gains at 49%, Low 25% LG at 40% Math Targets - Proficiency at 51%, Learning Gains at 47%, Low 25% LG at 38% Science Target - Proficiency at 40% Overall School Grade Target - 45% = C
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Santangelo (amy.santangelo@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction is the proven method to ensure each student makes gains and closes the achievement gap. Collaborative learning (such as teaming) is also successful in moving students forward for those at or above grade level.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group time with a teacher focused on specific targeted interventions is the most effective way reach students at their current level and then close gaps in their learning. On the 2019 FSA, learning gains for the low 25% averaged 34%, and learning gains for all level 1 and 2 students averaged only 10%, so there is an obvious need for targeted small group interventions. In addition, time on specific on-line learning platforms (Freckle, Reflex, iStation, SmartyAnts, Brain Pop) provides students a customized learning path. During the 18-19 year academic teaming was used extensively and level 3-5 students average learning gains were 71%, so continuing with rigorous, student directed tasks for level 3-5 students will help moving them forward.

Action Steps to Implement

Staff two Interventionists and two instructional Paraprofessionals who work directly with small groups of students using targeted interventions in ELA and Math. They will provide support to other staff with choosing and monitoring interventions that best meet the needs of each student.

Person Responsible	Amy Santangelo (amy.santangelo@polk-fl.net)

Purchase 70 iPads to facilitate student learning. Purchase LLI kits for power hour small group instruction. Purchase subscriptions for Reflex Math and BrainPOP to provide individualized learning tasks for students.

Person Responsible	Cindy Franks (cindy.franks@polk-fl.net)

Provide extended learning opportunities for students to help them close learning gaps and master grade level standards.

Person Responsible	Amy Santangelo (amy.santangelo@polk-fl.net)

Purchase varied supplies, including ink, to create learning materials focused on specific student needs.

Person Responsible	Cindy Franks (cindy.franks@polk-fl.net)

Purchase student agendas and materials for family involvement events to promote home-school communication and support for student learning at home.

Person Responsible Cindy Franks (cindy.franks@polk-fl.net)

Results of Reading Wonders and Math standards weekly assessments, along with Math module and Science quarterly assessments, will be used to plan differentiated learning tasks.

Person Responsible Amy Santangelo (amy.santangelo@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will us tools to track mastery of standards during standards aligned instruction and will use the results to inform small group instruction.

Person Responsible Amy Santangelo (amy.santangelo@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In accordance with our Needs Assessment/Analysis priorities, the Leadership Team will put priority on 5th grade for Science and Learning Gains, as well as SWD and ED students when making decisions and distributing resources. Examples include strategically placing interventionists, coaches modeling and/or co-teaching with the new 5th grade teacher, and district coaching with teachers of SWD.

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 Leadership Team will provide the following to ensure a positive culture and environment:
1. Build positive relationships with staff, students, and families so their ideas and voices can be heard and included.
2. Support new and newer teachers by funding and implementing the New Teacher Ambassador Program.
3. Administration will gain community support by joining the Mulberry Chamber of Commerce and working with the Concerned Citizens of Mulberry.
4. SAC meetings will be held regularly and include staff, parent, and community members to gather their input on the SIP, budget, current data, and any plans for the new building under construction.
5. CAT meetings will be held three times a year to present current data, goals, and areas of need to stakeholders.

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				$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				$267,863.55

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$27,580.00
			Notes: Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized - $250.00 to $999.99 - 70 iPads 128GB			
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$6,996.50
			Notes: Technology-Related Supplies - 70 iPad cases w/keyboards			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$6,245.00
			Notes: Technology-Related Rentals - of educational software and online subscriptions (BrainPOP & Reflex Math)			
	5100	510-Supplies	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$8,195.54
			Notes: Supplies - Instructional (paper, folders, envelopes, binders)			
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$48,772.56
			Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - School based/District paid Interventionist who work with small groups of students in need of remediation			
	5100	150-Aides	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$13,116.02
			Notes: Aides Paraprofessionals - Salaries - Classroom Paraprofessionals - who work under the direct supervision of a teacher to work with small groups of students in need of remediation			
	5100	210-Retirement	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$6,188.86
			Notes: Retirement - 10% - Instructional Personnel - Interventionist and Paraprofessional			
	5100	220-Social Security	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$4,734.46
			Notes: Social Security -7.65% -Instructional personnel - Interventionist and Paraprofessional			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$18,576.00
			Notes: Health and Hospitalization - Instructional Personnel - Interventionist and Paraprofessional			
	5100	232-Life Insurance	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$43.20
			Notes: Life Insurance - Instructional personnel - Interventionist and Paraprofessional			

	5100	240-Workers Compensation	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$117.59
		Notes: Workers Compensation - 0.19% - Instructional Personnel - Interventionist and Paraprofessional				
	5900	120-Classroom Teachers	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$7,791.21
		Notes: Classroom Teachers Classroom Teachers- Provide stipends to Teachers to provide supplemental after school, before school or Saturday tutoring 6 teachers, 60 hours per teacher				
	5900	210-Retirement	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,064.34
		Notes: Extended Learning Retirement				
	5900	220-Social Security	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$814.22
		Notes: Extended Learning SS				
	5900	240-Workers Compensation	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$20.22
		Notes: Extended Learning WC				
	5900	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$2,852.23
		Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - Stipends to coaches, interventionists, network manager, media specialist and or guidance counselor to provide supplementary after school, before school or Saturday tutoring 2 IPs, 60 hours per IP				
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$38,974.73
		Notes: Classroom Teachers - Stipends for Classroom Teachers participating in curriculum planning after contact hours 36 teachers, 48 hours per teacher				
	6300	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$10,885.74
		Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - Stipends- participating in curriculum planning after contact hours - Guidance Counselor, Network Mgr., and Interventionists 4 IP, 102 hours per IP				
	6300	210-Retirement	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$4,986.05
		Notes: Retirement - 10%- Curriculum Planning				
	6300	220-Social Security	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$3,814.34
		Notes: Social Security - 7.65% - Curriculum Planning				
	6300	240-Workers Compensation	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$94.74
		Notes: Workers Compensation - .19% - Curriculum Planning				
	5100	510-Supplies	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$7,750.00
		Notes: Classroom Libraries and/or guided reading books for 31 classrooms				
	6200	610-Library Books	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$7,750.00

			Notes: Library Books - Supplemental media materials and books - Level books, science books			
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,500.00
			Notes: Technology-Related Supplies (ink, toner)			
	5100	510-Supplies	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,000.00
			Notes: Supplies - Instructional (math manipulatives)			
	5100	510-Supplies	1151 - Kingsford Elementary School	UniSIG		$30,000.00
			Notes: Supplies - Instructional (LLI Kits)			
					Total:	**$276,165.00**