Killearn Lakes Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Killearn Lakes Elementary School

8037 DEER LK E, Tallahassee, FL 32312

https://www.leonschools.net/killearnlakes

Demographics

Principal: Jenny Bla IR

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Leon 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.](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

Killearn Lakes Elementary School

8037 DEER LK E, Tallahassee, FL 32312

https://www.leonschools.net/killearnlakes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	24%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon 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.

Killearn Lakes Elementary School provides students with an optimal learning enviroment to create and develop lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Killearn Lakes will be an engaging, safe and respectful learning enviroment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wagner, Brenda	Principal	The leadership team sets high expectations for teaching and learning. The leadership team leads the school community in communicating and implementing the school's vision.
McGrotha, Hank	Assistant Principal	The leadership team will identify resources to increase data driven decision making to support high quality instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/21/2021, Jenny Bla IR

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.*
14

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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
51

Total number of students enrolled at the school
782

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	108	122	110	142	144	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	764
Attendance below 90 percent	9	5	3	8	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	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		2	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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 7/21/2021

2020-21 - 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	125	111	134	138	139	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	788
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	11	8	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	4	2	0	0	1	2	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	

2020-21 - 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	125	111	134	138	139	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	788
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	11	8	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	4	2	0	0	1	2	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				83%	57%	57%	85%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				69%	54%	58%	73%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	47%	53%	62%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				84%	64%	63%	88%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				74%	63%	62%	79%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	45%	51%	69%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				76%	52%	53%	84%	52%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	88%	61%	27%	58%	30%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	81%	57%	24%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	56%	25%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	79%	63%	16%	62%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	90%	66%	24%	64%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2021					
	2019	80%	61%	19%	60%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	76%	54%	22%	53%	23%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

ELA Grades 1-5 STAR

Math Grades 1-5 iReady

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60	85	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	90	90	90
	Students With Disabilities	22	55	58
	English Language Learners	54	54	54
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25	55	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	90	90	90
	Students With Disabilities	5	7	12
	English Language Learners	7	12	20

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78	81	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	82	82	82
	Students With Disabilities	40	50	55
	English Language Learners	65	70	55
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	55	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	82	82	82
	Students With Disabilities	5	8	35
	English Language Learners	3	12	14

Grade 3			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70	77	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	90	90	90
	Students With Disabilities	33	43	43
	English Language Learners	34	34	34
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	58	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	84	84	84
	Students With Disabilities	5	8	8
	English Language Learners	4	11	13

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71	72	76
	Economically Disadvantaged	77	77	77
	Students With Disabilities	47	44	37
	English Language Learners	22	22	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52	70	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	66	66
	Students With Disabilities	4	13	11
	English Language Learners	4	5	22

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	59	68	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	69	72	72
	Students With Disabilities	22	22	25
	English Language Learners	14	28	28
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	56	70	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	92	92	92
	Students With Disabilities	95	100	100
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	76	78	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	87	87	87
	Students With Disabilities	65	67	67
	English Language Learners	57	71	75

Subgroup Data Review

	**2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	55	75	60	55	44		40				
ASN	94			94							
BLK	70	53		58	47		47				
HSP	71	55		66	36		82				
MUL	78			78							
WHT	79	72	60	75	49	47	79				
FRL	58	45		55	38		71				
	**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	45	51	38	52	49	36	38				
ELL	64			82							
ASN	92	78		88	89		85				
BLK	63	67	64	63	53						
HSP	86	62		86	54						
MUL	81	70		88	70						
WHT	85	69	49	85	75	55	79				
FRL	70	60	47	67	61	42	59				
	**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	50	54	37	47	47	38	37				
ELL	73			91							
ASN	92	94		88	89						
BLK	60	57		60	71						
HSP	84	69		95	85						
MUL	67	73		56	55						
WHT	87	73	61	91	80	76	85				
FRL	68	68	63	68	73	52	71				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	443
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	94
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	78

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	66
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The lowest performing sub group was in the learning gains of the lowest 25% for both ELA and Math. The biggest contributing factor for this decline, was most likely due to loss of academic instructional time and the other challenges that occurred during the school year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our greatest decline from the prior year of assessment was in the category of Math learning gains for the lowest 25% students. This year, only 38% of the students demonstrated learning gains which was a 21% drop from the previous testing year.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The biggest contributing factor this year was likely due to the need to make differentiated instruction and math interventions a greater priority as those students continue to need additional resources in order to show learning gains.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Killearn Lakes Elementary consistently scores above the State and District averages in all categories, however last school year we showed a decline in all components.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

As stated in above mentioned data analysis, we consistently have some of the highest scores in all components. This year we did not improve in any individual component.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

This year, we will address this by implementing inclusion for our ESE students.We feel that by implementing the inclusion model, we will see a vast improvement for our lowest 25% students. KLES also implements an after school intervention program (LEAPS) that helps struggling students with their math and reading skills.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The professional development opportunities that will be provided will include the following trainings: Freckles Math, IReady, Connect Ed, Generation Genius, and ELA Best Standards. Teachers will meet with administration team on a monthly basis to review student data.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Ongoing professional development throughout the school year and the implementation of the inclusion model will ensure the sustainability of improvement in the future.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math learning gains for students in the lowest 25% category have experienced a decline in the last several years after reviewing the testing data.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the percentage of students in our lowest 25% category to make a learning gain in Math by at least 5%.as demonstrated on the FSA Math assessment.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring will utilize iReady, STAR Math, and Go Math Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brenda Wagner (wagnerb@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with disabilities will be moved into an inclusion model for math instruction. An ESE teacher or a para professional will be placed in the general education classroom to support instruction and skill practice for students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusion for students with disabilities is an evidence based strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development to support co-teaching
Provide planning time for co-teachers
Progress Monitor using iReady, STAR Math and Go Math Assessments.

Person Responsible	Brenda Wagner (wagnerb@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading learning gains for students in the lowest 25% category have experienced a decline in the last several years after reviewing testing data.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the percentage of students in our lowest 25% category to make a learning gain in ELA by at least 5% as demonstrated on the FSA assessment.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring folders will be utilized for these targeted students. Some of the progress monitoring tools to be utilized include STAR, iReady,and Wonders assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brenda Wagner (wagnerb@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement research based intervention, conduct progress monitoring meetings to determine effectiveness of interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With strategic intervention and ongoing progress monitoring we will increase learning gains for these targeted students.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule ESE students into inclusion classrooms.
Progress Monitor using STAR, iReady and Wonders assessments

Person Responsible   Brenda Wagner (wagnerb@leonschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Achievement on the FCAT Science assessment for our 5th grade students have experienced a decline in the last several years.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the percentage of 5th grade students who demonstrate proficiency on the FCAT Science assessment by at least 3%.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring students on a monthly basis and analyze data to gauge student learning.District science assessments will be utilized as progress monitoring tools.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brenda Wagner (wagnerb@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The implemented evidence-based strategy is hands on learning utilized via project-based learning(experiments, science fair projects).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Higher student achievement will be attained through a collaborative, hands on learning process which will stimulate critical thinking skills.

Action Steps to Implement

We will be adding Science into our Special Area rotation. Students will be receiving additional instructional time in Science by adding science into our wheel.

Person Responsible   Brenda Wagner (wagnerb@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Discipline will be an area of focus for the upcoming school year. Our school will again utilize PBS. We will have monthly PBS meetings to monitor our discipline data.

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.

We provide numerous activities and opportunities that foster a positive school culture and environment. We provide classroom and school news to parents through newsletters, listserves, etc... In addition, KLES has been recognized at the state level for our annual "Friends-giving" event. The purpose of this event is to assist our students in building friendships and draw families to our school to connect with each other. In an effort to stop bullying before it starts, we created this event in hopes that we would bridge the gap across the grade levels and strengthen peer relations at our school. This event was recognized at the District level, and at the state level by receiving The Family and Community Involvement Award.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The leadership team will work hard in creating a positive school culture that has a meaningful impact on all stakeholders.The leadership team will continue to model the attitudes, values, and qualities that will foster a positive learning environment for all.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0481 - Killearn Lakes Elem. School	School Improvement Funds		$10,000.00
			Notes: We will utilize these funds to provide professional development for our teachers in Math intervention.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$0.00
					Total:	$10,000.00