# Earlington Heights Elementary School



# 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Earlington Heights Elementary School

### 4750 NW 22ND AVE, Miami, FL 33142

### http://earlingtonheightselem.dadeschools.net/

## Demographics

## Principal: Jackson Nicolas

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2020-21 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: D (40%)<br><br>2017-18: A (62%)<br><br>2016-17: B (61%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| **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 Dade 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

# Earlington Heights Elementary School

## 4750 NW 22ND AVE, Miami, FL 33142

## http://earlingtonheightselem.dadeschools.net/

## School Demographics

**School Type and Grades Served**
(per MSID File)

Elementary School
PK-5

**2020-21 Title I School**

Yes

**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**
(as reported on Survey 3)

94%

**Primary Service Type**
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

**Charter School**

No

**2018-19 Minority Rate**
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

99%

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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 staff, parents, and community of Earlington Heights Elementary School believe all students have the right and ability to learn. We are committed to providing a solid educational foundation for our students so they may achieve their highest academic potential, while maintaining steady, positive growth.

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

All stakeholders of Earlington Heights Elementary School envision a learning environment that nurtures and encourages students to achieve their full potential as life-long learners who become productive citizens and leaders.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Nicolas, Jackson | Principal | As the school's principal, Mr. Nicolas provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Mr. Nicolas establishes high expectations for all students, and ensures that, the school based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). |
| Cathey, Isahuri | Assistant Principal | As the assistant principal, Ms. Cathey works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. Ms. Cathey ensures fidelity of the MTSS monitoring by evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development with faculty needs. |
| Ramontal, Shahllynn | Reading Coach | As the reading coach, Ms. Ramontal provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Ramontal utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced–based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success. |
| Jhones, Lindsey | Science Coach | As the science coach, Ms. Jhones provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Jhones utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidence–based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success. |
| Javier, Estephany | Math Coach | As the math coach, Ms. Javier provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Javier utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced–based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Friday 7/1/2016, Jackson Nicolas

**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.*
3

**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.*
12

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
34

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**
322

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**
4

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**
3

**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 | 23 | 37 | 49 | 57 | 37 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 260 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 13 | 9 | 22 | 11 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 7 | 11 | 32 | 37 | 14 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |

**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 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |

**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 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**
Wednesday 6/30/2021

### 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 | 49 | 81 | 69 | 70 | 65 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 397 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 10 | 11 | 14 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in Math | 5 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 28 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 20 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |

**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 | 3 | 14 | 25 | 11 | 18 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |

**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 | 11 | 13 | 12 | 16 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

**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 | 49 | 81 | 69 | 70 | 65 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 397 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 10 | 11 | 14 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in Math | 5 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 28 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 20 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |

**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 | 3 | 14 | 25 | 11 | 18 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |

**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 | 11 | 13 | 12 | 16 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

## 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 | | | | 41% | 62% | 57% | 37% | 62% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 41% | 62% | 58% | 50% | 62% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 46% | 58% | 53% | 71% | 59% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 52% | 69% | 63% | 76% | 69% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 40% | 66% | 62% | 71% | 64% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 41% | 55% | 51% | 84% | 55% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 18% | 55% | 53% | 45% | 58% | 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 | 49% | 60% | -11% | 58% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 64% | -23% | 58% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 31% | 60% | -29% | 56% | -25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -41% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 67% | -4% | 62% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 69% | -10% | 64% | -5% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | -63% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 65% | -30% | 60% | -25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -59% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 21% | 53% | -32% | 53% | -32% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level used to compile the below data were obtained by data from Power BI by subgroup and grade level. Grades K-5 used iReady Data AP1 for Fall, AP2 for Winter, and AP3 for Spring. Also, the school utilized Grade 5 Science Mid-Year Assessment data.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 24% | 14% | 36% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 24% | 14% | 36% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 14% | 0 | 11% |
| | English Language Learners | 22% | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 12% | 10% | 26% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12% | 10% | 26% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 14% | 0 | 14% |
| | English Language Learners | 11% | 11% | 11% |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 23% | 25% | 33% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 21% | 23% | 32% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7% | 14% | 7% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 16% | 29% | 32% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 14% | 28% | 30% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 24% | 38% | 56% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 25% | 39% | 57% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 10% | 30% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 5% | 22% | 57% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 5% | 23% | 58% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 20% | 40% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 17% | 30% | 49% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17% | 31% | 50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7% | 8% | 33% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 11% | 30% | 60% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12% | 30% | 60% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 14% | 53% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 17% | 27% | 44% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17% | 27% | 44% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8% | 23% | 33% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 16% | 52% | 71% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16% | 52% | 71% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 21% | 54% | 71% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 0 | 10% | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 10% | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 15% | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## 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 | 26 | 44 | 55 | 49 | 78 | | 38 | | | | |
| ELL | 44 | 42 | | 70 | 62 | | 67 | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | 33 | 50 | 51 | 44 | 50 | 20 | | | | |
| HSP | 44 | 39 | | 61 | 58 | | 56 | | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 34 | 47 | 53 | 49 | 60 | 31 | | | | |

| 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 | 17 | 26 | 41 | 38 | 21 | | 6 | | | | |
| ELL | 57 | 58 | | 67 | 58 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 38 | 41 | 47 | 38 | 40 | 13 | | | | |
| HSP | 51 | 51 | 60 | 63 | 47 | | 38 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 41 | 46 | 52 | 40 | 41 | 18 | | | | |

| 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 | 18 | 52 | 73 | 85 | 93 | 100 | 9 | | | | |
| ELL | 54 | 67 | | 79 | 55 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 49 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 81 | 44 | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 48 | | 89 | 62 | | 50 | | | | |
| FRL | 37 | 49 | 70 | 76 | 70 | 83 | 45 | | | | |

## 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 | 45 |
| 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 | 47 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 362 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 48 |
| 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 | 55 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 41 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 51 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 45 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

## 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?

Based on FSA Math data there was a fidelity of explicit instruction in mathematics which contributed to the data increasing in proficiency from 52 percentage points in 2019 to 54 percentage points in 2021. We see also see an upward trend in 3rd/4th grade in Reading and Math based on the data from AP1 to AP3.
2021: the following data components from the 2021 data showed the greatest improvement Mathematics increased from 52 percentage points in 2019 to 54 percentage points in 2021.

2021: The data component that showed the lowest performance on 2021 FSA was ELA and ELA learning gains. Based on the 2021 ELA FSA, the following data components from the 2021 data showed the greatest need when compared to the school's overall data. ELA Learning Gains decreased from 41 percentage points in 2018 to 31 percentage points on the 2021 FSA. It was a low performance compared to the rest of the school's data. A possible contributing factor for the low performance was that students entered the grade level with a need for foundational skills in phonics and comprehension. Fidelity to instructional practices to accommodate the needs of all students by teachers in the third grade could have also been attributed to the lack of progress. When analyzing past data for this specific group of students we found that they have historically performed poorly on iReady diagnostic and SAT10 assessments. The data also shows that the students from the 2018-2019 school year showed little movement in tiers.

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

2019: the following data components from our 2019 data showed that the greatest need, when compared to the state average, was 5th Grade Science. A possible contributing factor for the low performance in this area is that students were not meeting proficiency on various Topic Assessment. Remediation of these benchmarks was not monitored utilizing a Data Tracker. The teachers needed support for effective Science instruction.

2021: the following data components from the 2021 data showed the greatest need when compared to the school's previous data. ELA Learning Gains decreased from 41 percentage points in 2019 to 31 percentage points on the 2021 FSA.

**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 contributing factors for this need for improvement for the 2019 school year would be the lack of direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. The actions that will be taken are remediation of standards during interventions and through extended learning opportunities utilizing high yield strategies by teachers. The collaboration of a science transformation coach to plan with all teachers on a weekly basis. The science transformation coach will implement strategies to be included during differentiated instruction.

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

2019: The area with the most improvement was first-grade reading. The percentage of students that achieved proficiency was as follows: 6% (2018-2019) and 32% (2019- 2020) which shows a 26 percentage points increase.

2021: The areas with the most improvement according to the 2021 data were the 5th Grade Science with an increase from 18 percentage points in 2018 to 32 percentage points on the 2021 FSA.

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

2019: The use of explicit instruction in phonics by teachers during interventions and DI was a contributing factor in improving students' proficiency. The new action that the school implemented in this area was the implementation of interventionists in the grade level which provided a small group setting and strategic interventions.

2021: The use of targeted interventions by grade level during our intervention time as well as during differentiated instruction in all content areas assisted in improving our overall data.

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

Differentiated Instruction
Interventions
Student Engagement
Collaborative Structures

**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 following professional development opportunities will be offered; targetted instructing during DI, training on new Interventions programs for all teachers and interventionist, strategies to enhance student engagement, and collaborative structures during the planning and whole group delivery of instruction.

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

To ensure sustainability we will continue to monitor student attendance through homeroom tracking monitors and daily attendance bulletins. We will also continue to send ConnectEd messages to parents. We will provide students with attendance incentives to encourage them to show up to school each day. Intervention programs will include foundational basics skills, diagnostic assessments to monitor student progress, and resources for parents to assist at home.

# Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Based on the data, student engagement is critical for student achievement because we had a large percentage with a large number of absences. The students failed to meet proficiency on various assessments. Student engagement is beneficial for all students because it motivates students to practice higher-level critical thinking skills. In addition, student engagement promotes meaningful learning experiences through relationship building. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | If teachers implement high yielding engagement strategies with fidelity, then 50% of third, fourth, and fifth grade students will show proficiency on the 2021-2022 Florida Standards Assessment. |
| **Monitoring:** | Student Engagement will be monitored through classroom observations, data chats, student work folders, implementation of learned strategies during whole/small group lesson with accountability. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teachers will be implementing effective engagement strategies to meet the needs of all of our students. Strategies will be acquired through independent professional development, collaborative planning, faculty meetings, coaching cycles, and mentorship. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | If the effective engagement strategies are implemented with purpose then we will see an increase in student achievement. |

| Action Steps to Implement |
|---|

9/8-10/11-Professional Development for teachers on engagement strategies will be shared during faculty meetings. During each meeting, a teacher leader will be selected to share an engagement strategy. As a result, teachers will have an expert in the building to observe the strategy and implementation.

| **Person Responsible** | Shahllynn Ramontal (sramontal@dadeschools.net) |
|---|---|

8/31-10/11- Teachers will collaboratively discuss best practices on engagement strategies during collaborative planning by content and identify a strategy to utilize. As a result, teachers will implement the strategy during instructional delivery.

| **Person Responsible** | Estephany Javier (ejavier@dadeschools.net) |
|---|---|

8/31-10/11- The Leadership Team will meet weekly to discuss student engagement throughout the school and identify teachers for potential coaching cycles. As a result, coaches will provide targeted coaching cycles to teachers based on student data.

| **Person Responsible** | Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net) |
|---|---|

9/8- Teachers will collaborate and brainstorm a schoolwide engagement strategy to be utilized by all teachers for one month. As a result, teachers will be able to share best practices, challenges, and potential shifts in strategy in order to engage students.

| **Person Responsible** | Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net) |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| **#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Based on the data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of ELA. We selected the overarching area of ELA based on our findings that demonstrated 40% proficiency in ELA for grades 3 – 5 on the 2021 FSA. We compared the current 2021 ELA FSA data of 40% proficiency to the 2019 FSA ELA proficiency of 41%. Over the last two years, ELA proficiency only increased by3 percentage points. Tier 1 instruction, in addressing the targeted standard and delivery, did not result in an increase in proficient students. Therefore, we will strategically develop, explicitly deliver, and systematically monitor tier 1 instruction.<br><br>Based on the 2020-2021 i-Ready AP3 diagnostic, 46% of students in kindergarten through grade 3, were not on track to score on or above grade level on the 2021 i-Ready AP1 diagnostic. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | If teachers are explicit during tier 1 ELA instruction, engaged in collaborative planning, monitoring data, and utilizing appropriate resources, then 50% of third, fourth, and fifth grad students will demonstrate proficiency on the 2021-2022 Florida Standards Assessment. Our ELA proficient students will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points as evidenced by the 2022 State Assessment. |
| **Monitoring:** | The Leadership team will participate in weekly collaborative planning, followed up by a targeted walk-through with a specific look-for that monitors the alignment of collaborative planning to instructional delivery of tier 1 instruction. ELA instruction will also be monitored through student work folders, administrative data chats, and peer observations. Targeted feedback will be provided to all teachers weekly and instructional shifts in support and tier 1 planning will occur, based on feedback provided. Transformation Coaches will collaboratively plan with teachers, utilizing instructional resources that define the expectation of the standards. Progress monitoring data and explicit feedback will be utilized to adjust delivery and tier 1 planning sessions. Data analysis of progress monitoring assessments, as well as the review of student work products, will be utilized to track student progress and determine the effectiveness of standard-based instruction and planning. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Within the Targeted Element of ELA, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Differentiated Instruction. Teachers will be implement differentiated instruction during ELA with fidelity and be held accountable for knowing their student's data by updating trackers, monitoring student progress, and utilizing effective resources. Differentiated Instruction planning will focus on aligning resources to student needs, product reviews, and progress monitoring performance. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. If DI is implemented in an effective manner then that will lead to shifts in our instruction that will meet the needs of our learners and will yield greater student achievement. |
| **Action Steps to Implement** | |

8/31-10/11 Teachers will participate in weekly collaboratively planning, with a focus on standards-aligned instruction, resulting in an explicit lesson plan that includes the gradual release model.

**Person Responsible**   Star Grimm (sgrimm@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11- Transformation Coaches will facilitate ELA collaborative planning meetings to develop DI lesson plans that are aligned to student needs based on Progress Monitoring Assessment. As a result, ELA instruction will include explicit instruction to accelerate students learning.

**Person Responsible**   Shahllynn Ramontal (sramontal@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11-Teachers will implement data trackers that can be used to track ELA whole group and intervention assessments in order to assess small group instruction. Teachers will use data trackers to monitor student progress and adjust as necessary.

**Person Responsible**   Shahllynn Ramontal (sramontal@dadeschools.net)

9/13-10/11- Teachers and interventionists will utilize AP1 data to establish ELA DI groups, rotations, and align resources based on student needs. DI rotations will be posted in each classroom and student work folders will be used as evidence of differentiated instruction.

**Person Responsible**   Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

| | |
|---|---|
| **#3. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | The school leadership team will continue to engage the team by delegating responsibilities across all stakeholders. Teachers will be given the opportunity to lead clubs, activities, grade levels, and subject areas of their personal interest or specialty. Teachers are also going to be given leadership opportunities by taking roles in collaborative planning sessions for certain tasks to have ownership of. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | If the administrative team provides teacher leaders opportunities for input on school wide decisions, then our teachers will be given the opportunity to develop as leaders. In turn, this will amplify teachers voice and expand teacher buy-in. The percentage of teachers in leadership roles will increase by at least 20% for the 2021-2022 school year. |
| **Monitoring:** | The leadership team will solicit staff members that will serve as leaders to begin development on school initiatives. This opportunity will be apparent by teacher leaders sharing resources and pertinent, timely information to all stakeholders. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The evidence-based strategy we will be implementing is shared leadership. Shared leadership at our school will entail implementing grade level chairs to develop leadership opportunities for all solicited teacher leaders. We hope to increase the feeling of shared leadership. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | By creating grade level department chairs it will prompt teacher leaders to hone in on their craft and talents which will contribute to the integration of the schools vision and mission. |

| |
|---|
| **Action Steps to Implement** |

8/31-10/11- Teachers will be assigned various responsibilities across the school and meet on a monthly basis to discuss outcomes, challenges, and next steps. As a result, teachers will feel empowered and part of the organization.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net) |

9/8- During the September Faculty Meeting teachers will be provided a survey to complete to identify a club, initiative, or activity that they would like to lead for the school year. As a result, the administrative team will have teacher preference and allow teacher leaders the autonomy to lead clubs within the building in order to build teacher and or staff leaders.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net) |

10/6-Teachers and staff members will participate in FIU's Leadership Training in order to identify teacher's strengths in order to hone in on individuals' talents.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net) |

8/31-10/11- Grade level chairs will be selected and will begin to meet with the administrative team on a monthly basis to discuss upcoming events, calendars, and support being provided by the leadership team based on grade level needs.

**Person Responsible** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

| #4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Based on the 2020-2021 School Climate student survey results, 46% of the students agreed that there is an overall issue with bullying and a slight concern with violence in our school. 38% of our students agreed or strongly agreed that violence served as an issue. Choosing this goal with provide an environment for students and staff alike to feel secure to set and achieve goals while building and maintaining positive relationships. |
| Measurable Outcome: | If teachers successfully implement the Social Emotional Learning strategies in the classroom then we will start to see a decrease in referrals and an increase in attendance. Lastly, on the school climate student survey we will see at least a 10% decrease in student responses for bullying and violence at our school. |
| Monitoring: | This will be monitored through the number of referrals submitted to administration and/or the school counselor as well as the attendance bulletin. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | The evidence based strategy we will be implementing is social emotional learning. Teacher will also implement digital citizenship lessons within their classroom. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Based on the 2020-2021 School Climate student survey results, 46% of the students agreed that there is an overall issue with bullying and a slight concern with violence in our school. 38% of our students agreed or strongly agreed that violence served as an issue. With the implementation of social emotional learning and digital citizenship students should see a decrease in bullying and violence. |

## Action Steps to Implement

9/8-Mental Health coordinator will provide teachers and staff with an overview of resources and support available to all students and staff members. As a result, on a weekly basis teachers will be able to collaborate with the coordinator to address student needs.

| Person Responsible | Frances Vasquez (vasquezf@dadeschools.net) |
|---|---|

8/31-10/1- The administrative team will assist the Mental Health Coordinator in identifying students to meet with the coordinator to discuss student progress, coping skills, and provide families with resources.

| Person Responsible | Frances Vasquez (vasquezf@dadeschools.net) |
|---|---|

9/2-10/11- Professional Development for staff members on conflict resolution strategies will be incorporated during monthly faculty meetings. As a result, teachers will be able to provide students with strategies when issues arise between students.

| Person Responsible | Frances Vasquez (vasquezf@dadeschools.net) |
|---|---|

8/31-10/11- Teachers will collaboratively plan for lessons that are inclusive of Social-Emotional Learning. During weekly collaborative planning meetings, teachers will review Social-Emotional Learning activities within pacing guides and identify relevant activities based on student needs.

| Person Responsible | Shahllynn Ramontal (sramontal@dadeschools.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.

**According to the 2021-2022 District/School Disciplinary Comparison data from Power BI SIP Dashboard, 19% of students at Earlington Heights have accumulated 31+ absences as compared to 10% at the District level overall. This specific discipline shows a 9% increase to that of the District. Monitoring student attendance is essential in ensuring students are proficient by the end of the school year. The School Leadership Team (SLT) will monitor student attendance via a daily attendance bulletin, phone calls to conference with parents daily, home visits by the attendance committee, and by providing families the support needed by school site administrators and or community involvement specialists.**

## 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.**

Consider what your current reality is, and describe that current reality inclusive of your current practices.

At Earlington Heights we address creating a positive school culture by involving all stakeholders in regards to school improvement. That is the key to our schools success. In an effort to build a positive school culture and environment, all stakeholders are encouraged to attend our monthly EESAC (Educational Excellence School Advisory Council) meetings. During these meetings, stakeholders are apprised of all changes related to school academics and budgetary matters. Stakeholders have an opportunity to share their concerns or add any suggestions to the School Improvement Plan. Additionally, all stakeholders are invited to our Annual Title One meeting. During this time stakeholders have an opportunity to give their input regarding the PFEP (Parent Family and Engagement Plan). This plan allows parents and guardians to see the various resources that will be used for student achievement. Also, through Title 1 our school offers Parent workshops to equip parents with community resources and address topics on social-emotional learning.

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

Consider what your current reality is, and describe the stakeholders who are involved in your current practices as it relates to building positive school culture.

At Earlington Heights our stakeholders are Ms. Vasquez (School Counselor), Ms. Wilson (1st grade teacher), Ms. Cathey (Assistance Principal), Ms. Dixon (2nd grade teacher/21st Century Lead). Our team will continue to engage all stakeholders including members of our EESAC in order to build a positive school culture.

## 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 | | | | $58,103.00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl | UniSIG | 0.89 | $47,559.00 |
| | | | Notes: Classroom Hourly Teachers and Hourly Interventionists for supplemental instructional support that will include various delivery models to improve learning gains through small group instruction during the school day and extended learning opportunities before, during, or after the school day, tutorial sessions during Saturday Academy and/or during Winter and Spring Recess Camps. Approximately 3 hourly interventionists and/or hourly teachers for 20-30 weeks for 4-5 days a week for 4-6 hours a day at an average of $26-36/hour to service extended learning opportunities to increase student achievement. | | | |
| | 5100 | 210-Retirement | 1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl | UniSIG | 0.0 | $5,655.00 |
| | | | Notes: Retirement for Classroom Hourly Teachers and Hourly Interventionists | | | |
| | 5100 | 220-Social Security | 1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl | UniSIG | 0.0 | $3,638.00 |
| | | | Notes: Social Security for Classroom Hourly Teachers and Hourly Interventionists | | | |
| | 5100 | 240-Workers Compensation | 1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl | UniSIG | 0.0 | $1,251.00 |
| | | | Notes: Workers Compensation for Classroom Hourly Teachers and Hourly Interventionists | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | $7,000.25 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized | 1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl | UniSIG | 0.0 | $7,000.25 |
| | | | Notes: Non-Capitalized Computer Hardware - To purchase approximately 14 desktop computers (approximately $500 each) to improve small group and differentiated instruction, enhance and supplement the development of conceptual meaning and technology based interventions centered on students' needs and further differentiated instruction for individual student learning within the student block. | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development | | | | $81,553.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl | UniSIG | 1.0 | $58,228.00 |
| | | | Notes: Other Certified Personnel- Transformation Science Coach to improve science proficiency, support school transformation and turnaround efforts, interventions and wraparound services for ETO-School Improvement. | | | |
| | 6400 | 210-Retirement | 1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl | UniSIG | 0.0 | $6,923.00 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *Notes: Retirement for Other Certified Personnel-Transformation Science Coach* | | | |
| | 6400 | 220-Social Security | 1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl | UniSIG | 0.0 | $4,454.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Social Security for Other Certified Personnel-Transformation Science Coach* | | | |
| | 6400 | 230-Group Insurance | 1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl | UniSIG | 0.0 | $10,417.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Medical Benefits for Other Certified Personnel-Transformation Science Coach* | | | |
| | 6400 | 240-Workers Compensation | 1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl | UniSIG | 0.0 | $1,531.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Workers Compensation for Other Certified Personnel-Transformation Science Coach* | | | |
| **4** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning** | | | | **$0.00** |
| | | | | | **Total:** | **$146,656.25** |