

Polk County Public Schools

# Kathleen Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>10</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>15</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>20</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>20</b> |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>23</b> |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>25</b> |

## Kathleen Elementary School

3515 SHERETZ RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/kathleenel>

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections   | Title I Schoolwide Program                                      | Charter Schools        |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)   |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)   |                        |
| I-E: Early Warning System  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)                                    | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-A-C: Data Review  |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring  | ESSA 1114(b)(3)   |                        |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection                                    | ESSA 1114(b)(6)   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)   |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)                                       |                        |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements   | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>ESSA 1116(b-g) |                        |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## **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 Department 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.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

Kathleen Elementary School is committed to collaborating with teachers, staff, parents, guardians, community partners, and students to provide a rigorous, real world learning experience that results in high academic achievement and responsible citizens; within a learning environment that supports equitable opportunities for ALL students.

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

"Building Leaders Today, to Change the World Tomorrow!"

Motto: We are Cougar L.E.A.D.E.R.S.

Love Learning, Excel in All We Do, Achieve Goals Together, Do What is Right, Empower Others, Respect Yourself, Smile Every day!

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

#### **School Leadership Team**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name             | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Upton, Tracie    | Principal           | Tracie Upton is the Principal who implements the vision of the instructional leader. As the Principal Ms. Upton takes an active role in grade level planning sessions, data meetings, and observes teachers to give immediate feedback on teaching practices.   |
| Long, Megan      | Assistant Principal | Megan Long is the Assistant Principal and helps implement the vision of the instructional leader. As the Assistant Principal Megan Long takes an active role in grade level planning sessions, data meetings, and observes teachers to give immediate feedback on teaching practices.   |
| Jeffers, Lindz   | Math Coach          | Lindz Jeffers serves as the school's STEM Interventionist. Ms. Jeffers uses her expertise to help teachers understand the full intent of the Math and Science standards and models examples of these tasks. In classrooms, Ms. Jeffers observes teachers and gives suggestions to improve students engagement and rigor. She will also be facilitating the use of the Science lab conducting experiments with students based on the curriculum. |
| Green, Priscilla | Reading Coach       | Priscilla Green serves as the school's Reading Coach. During planning sessions Ms. Green uses her expertise to help teachers understand the full extent of the ELA standards and gives examples of tasks that will reach the full intent of the standards. In classrooms, Ms. Green observes teachers and gives suggestions to improve student engagement and rigor.  |
| Miller, Tracy    | Other               | Tracy Miller serves as the school's Reading Interventionist. She works with students who are not yet proficient in their grade level. She uses her reading expertise to intervene and provide direct instruction of reading strategies.   |
| Jones, John      | Behavior Specialist | John Jones serves as the school's behavior Interventionist. He works with students who are not yet proficient in their grade level. He uses his PBIIS expertise to intervene and provide direct instruction of behavior strategies.   |
| Mejias, Sylvia   | Other               | Sylvia Mejias serves as the school's Math Interventionist. She works with students who are not yet proficient in their grade level. She uses her math expertise to intervene and provide direct instruction of mathematics strategies.  |

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Administration determined the goals based upon school data and culture was previous years and shared with leadership team, teachers and support staff. The SIP was shared during pre-planning and there was

ample opportunity for staff to provide input. During our first SAC meeting, we will share the SIP with the council and provide the same opportunity for input. Parents and families are invited to be on the SAC team to reflect all stakeholders.

### SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored weekly through the discussion of data with our school based leadership team. In addition, staff will also revisit the SIP during collaborative planning to monitor their implementation and discuss the impact it has made on student achievement. If any stakeholders see a need to revise the plan based upon current data, it will be discussed collaboratively as a staff and shared with stakeholders.

### Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | Yes   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 53%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 100%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | CSI   |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)*<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)*<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)*<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: D<br>2019-20: C<br>2018-19: C<br>2017-18: C  |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |   |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |   |

### Early Warning Systems



**Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |     | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|-----|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 |     |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 33          | 29 | 37 | 28 | 26 | 34 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 187 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 2           | 5  | 5  | 7  | 4  | 17 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 40  |       |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 4           | 15 | 19 | 23 | 7  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 68  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 2           | 7  | 25 | 8  | 20 | 4  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 77  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 27 | 17 | 22 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 66  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 32 | 19 | 34 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 85  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 13          | 27 | 27 | 27 | 16 | 22 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 132 |       |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 5           | 15 | 16 | 35 | 22 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132   |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:**

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

#### **Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |     | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |     |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0           | 39 | 39 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 170 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 15 | 10 | 11 | 6  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51  |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 1  | 7  | 22 | 8  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 1  | 3  | 23 | 8  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |     |       |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |     | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |     |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0           | 39 | 39 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 170 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 15 | 10 | 11 | 6  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51  |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 1  | 7  | 22 | 8  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 1  | 3  | 23 | 8  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |     |       |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

| Accountability Component        | 2023   |          |       | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                                 | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement*                | 39     | 45       | 53    | 39     | 47       | 56    | 33     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 46     |          |       | 33     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 32     |          |       | 33     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 37     | 49       | 59    | 30     | 42       | 50    | 39     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 41     |          |       | 31     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 36     |          |       | 35     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 36     | 41       | 54    | 34     | 49       | 59    | 34     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        |          |       |        | 56       | 64    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        |          |       |        | 45       | 52    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 39       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 59     | 54       | 59    | 50     |          |       | 58     |          |       |

*\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 41  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 5   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 207 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 5   |

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| Percent Tested  | 100 |
| Graduation Rate |     |

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 39  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 5   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 308 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 8   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100 |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)****2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| SWD           | 31                              | Yes                | 2   | 2   |
| ELL           | 28                              | Yes                | 4   | 1   |
| AMI           |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN           |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK           | 24                              | Yes                | 4   | 2   |
| HSP           | 38                              | Yes                | 2   |   |
| MUL           |                                 |                    |   |   |
| PAC           |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT           | 45                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL           | 39                              | Yes                | 2   |   |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |                                 |                    |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup                      | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD                                | 28                              | Yes                | 1   | 1   |
| ELL                                | 32                              | Yes                | 3   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 22                              | Yes                | 3   | 1   |
| HSP                                | 39                              | Yes                | 1   |   |
| MUL                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 41                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 38                              | Yes                | 1   |   |

### Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 39       |        |             | 37        |         |              | 36       |         |           |                   |                     | 59           |
| SWD  | 28       |        |             | 28        |         |              | 40       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| ELL  | 5        |        |             | 21        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 3                   | 59           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 25       |        |             | 14        |         |              | 33       |         |           |                   | 3                   |              |
| HSP  | 34       |        |             | 34        |         |              | 28       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 58           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 48       |        |             | 47        |         |              | 43       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| FRL  | 35       |        |             | 32        |         |              | 33       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 65           |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 39       | 46     | 32          | 30        | 41      | 36           | 34       |         |           |                   |                     | 50           |
| SWD  | 21       | 56     | 36          | 9         | 38      | 31           | 8        |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 24       | 50     |             | 17        | 48      |              | 5        |         |           |                   |                     | 50           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 21       | 31     |             | 11        | 25      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 34       | 52     | 44          | 25        | 44      | 50           | 14       |         |           |                   |                     | 52           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 46       | 46     | 33          | 40        | 43      | 25           | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 35       | 45     | 33          | 27        | 42      | 43           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     | 47           |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 33       | 33     | 33          | 39        | 31      | 35           | 34       |         |           |                   |                     | 58           |
| SWD  | 9        | 15     |             | 15        | 31      |              | 9        |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 22       | 50     |             | 39        | 42      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     | 58           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 16       | 31     |             | 19        | 8       |              | 18       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 22       | 30     |             | 30        | 36      |              | 24       |         |           |                   |                     | 57           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 45       | 37     |             | 51        | 38      |              | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 29       | 33     | 36          | 35        | 30      | 18           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     | 56           |

### Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA   |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 38%    | 43%      | -5%                        | 54%   | -16%                    |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 40%    | 53%      | -13%                       | 58%   | -18%                    |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 35%    | 42%      | -7%                        | 50%   | -15%                    |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 42%    | 51%      | -9%                        | 59%   | -17%                    |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 46%    | 56%      | -10%                       | 61%   | -15%                    |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 27%    | 44%      | -17%                       | 55%   | -28%                    |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 35%    | 39%      | -4%                        | 51%   | -16%                    |

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

According to PM3, 5th grade math was the lowest performing group. However, overall ELA was the lowest performing subject. The contributing factors to the low math performance was a new teacher in the grade who did not have a good understanding of the math benchmarks, due to lack of learning arc use in planning. The contributing factors to the overall ELA proficiency is due to the lack of understanding of the benchmark expectations (again lack of learning arc use in planning), which caused the delivery of instruction to be ineffective.

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

ELA is down 1%, the most significant decline from the previous year. The most contributing factors to the decline are behaviors, quality of instruction, and library. An increase in behaviors caused students to miss a lot of instructional time. Additionally, students were promoted to third grade with reading levels below grade level. Reading support services, including a media specialist and student support staff, were missing from last year's staff. Thus, the media center was closed for much of the year. Another lack of reading support was an inconsistency in Power Hour instruction and low quality of instruction.

**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.**

Third through fifth grade Math had tremendous gaps overall due to introducing the new benchmarks where key concepts had not been covered in earlier standards from the school year prior. This led to math teachers having to fill gaps from the previous grade levels, created from the new benchmarks. Additionally, teacher turnover affected the foundational instruction of the new benchmarks in upper elementary grade levels.

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

Math overall showed the most improvement at 9%. Contributing factors were the addition of a math coach and math interventionist who implemented Number Worlds, an intervention and prevention resource. Additionally, administrators rearranged staff for teachers with higher expectations and instruction to work in upper elementary classrooms.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

Our first concern is that gradebooks are not reflecting student achievement levels on PM3. This tells us that the tasks teachers are grading are not aligned to the benchmark and/or they are being graded for completion and not mastery of the benchmark. Another concern is that students are failing courses and state assessments, but not being retained.

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

1. increase reading proficiency 2. improve quality of science instruction 3. increase fidelity of intervention programs 4. increase math proficiency

#### **Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)



**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to climate/culture survey data, there showed a significant need to grow collaboration and respect between all staff members and students. "Grow collaborative and respect between all students and staff."

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The collaboration and respect between teachers and students will increase teacher retention as evidenced by a decrease in teacher transfers and discipline referrals by 10%.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Quarterly climate surveys will be sent to staff to monitor their perception of the collaboration around our campus. The data from this survey will give the administrative team areas of growth to focus on for the following quarter. Discipline reports will be reviewed monthly with the PBIS team and team members will report back to their respective grade levels. In sharing the discipline data, we will increase school-wide buy in and share the responsibility of holding all students to high expectations, not just the classroom teacher.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Megan Long (megan.long@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Build up staff morale and school culture. Administration will provide supportive and shared leadership structures for teachers in order to ensure a positive school culture and effective professional learning communities that impact school improvement. Classroom teachers deliver PBIS lessons throughout the year that focus on specific areas of concern using discipline data. For example, one of our school expectations is to be respectful. If we see through data that respect is an issue, teachers will focus their PBIS instruction that week/month on how to be respectful and what that looks and sounds like.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With new administration, we saw a need to pour into our staff and let them know we care about them and value their contribution to our school. New administration will work directly with teachers to create leadership structure to directly impact school improvement through professional learning communities, building our teacher's confidence in their assigned position.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Monthly staff treats

**Person Responsible:** Megan Long (megan.long@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** Monthly

Incentives for teacher attendance

**Person Responsible:** Tracie Upton (tracie.upton@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** Monthly

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to Progress Monitoring and FAST data, there showed a significant need for support in core instruction based on the proficiency levels of students across the board. "High impact instruction with the use of instructional coaching."

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Through instructional coaching, with support from Senior Coordinators of Instruction, we will increase teacher capacity of the benchmarks which will then improve overall proficiency in ELA and Math by 3% as evidenced by FAST Progress Monitoring Administration. State data will show a minimum of 3% proficiency increase for all grades and content areas as well as the number of students below the proficiency threshold will decrease by 8-10%.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Through the use of the Standards Based tracking data collection tool (SBI tool), we will be able to identify teachers, by the end of August, who need instructional coaching to build their capacity of the benchmarks.

By the middle of October, coaching logs will show 80% of the teachers that received coaching cycles improved standards focus board (posted for compliance, teacher use, and student use) to show 85% of the walks are scoring 100% based on SBI tool on the standards focus board section. Data will also show 80% of the teachers that received coaching cycles improved instructional delivery (materials and tasks matches focus board benchmark) to show 85% of the walks are scoring 100% based on SBI tool on the instructional delivery section. Data will show 80% of the teachers that received coaching cycles improved Assessment Data (appropriate use of formative and summative assessments) to show 85% of the walks are scoring 66% based on SBI tool on Assessment data section.

Diagnostic assessments will be given 3 times per year. Teachers will use this data to make informed decisions on differentiated instruction. In addition, teacher will use data from FAST PM and STAR to triangulate student data to determine areas of strength and identify areas of growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tracie Upton (tracie.upton@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The Learning Arc tool will be utilized weekly during collaborative planning with fidelity. In addition, we will utilize a reading and math interventionist to close the learning gaps in low performing students. Our Title 1 para will be working to help communicate high impact instruction to parents as well as supporting in the classrooms with interventions directed by the classroom teacher.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Learning Arc is a district initiative that we are supporting to help our teachers better understand the benchmarks and learn what mastery looks like for students.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

## Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The Learning Arc will be used with fidelity weekly during collaborative planning. Coaches will have steps 1-3 prepared for collaborative discussion. This conversation will lead to development of aligned objectives and from there identify appropriate tasks that are aligned (steps 4-5 of the arc). Administration will assist with identifying and creating opportunities for formative assessment during the instruction that will show the teacher if students have mastered the objective/benchmark (step 6). Teachers, coaches and administration will work together to either create or review district resources to provide students with an equivalent experience (step 7).

**Person Responsible:** Tracie Upton (tracie.upton@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** Weekly check-in

During leadership team, administration and coaches tier teachers and determine specific areas of support. Coaches then create a schedule for each week based upon SBI data from the previous week. Coaches are documenting the teacher, area of support, action plan and teacher outcome each week. This information is then discussed with administration.

**Person Responsible:** Megan Long (megan.long@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** Monthly check-in

**CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Title 1 Para- H. Lima-Jones

UniSig Interventionists- Math: Sylvia Meijas and Reading: Tracy Miller

UniSig Para-LaTorei Poe

**Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Explicit instruction of phonics and phonemic awareness in K-2 using the Reading Mastery intervention curriculum.

### Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Explicit instruction of reading comprehension and fluency in 3-5 using the Corrective Reading intervention curriculum.

### Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

### Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Kg- 75% will score a level 3 or higher on the FAST PM3.  
 1st- 75% will score a level 3 or higher on the FAST PM3.  
 2nd- 75% will score a level 3 or higher on the FAST PM3.  
 3rd- 50% will score a level 3 or higher on the FAST PM3.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

3rd- 50% will score a level 3 or higher on the FAST PM3.  
 4th- 40% will score a level 3 or higher on the FAST PM3.  
 5th- 45% will score a level 3 or higher on the FAST PM3.

### Monitoring

**Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Administration will monitor the use of both Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading by conducting walkthroughs during Power Hour. Teachers will use the curriculum's progress monitoring and the data will be reviewed monthly during PLCs.

**Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Upton, Tracie, [tracie.upton@polk-fl.net](mailto:tracie.upton@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs****Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Corrective Reading and Reading Mastery are both district and state approved curriculums that align with the district Comprehensive Reading Plan and BEST Standards.

**Rationale:**

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The evidence-based programs have addressed the identified need for ELA proficiency growth and have shown a proven record of effectiveness for the targeted population.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Professional Learning will address the need for literacy proficiency by providing a process for analyzing the BEST benchmarks and task alignment.  | Green, Priscilla,                 |
| 2. Literacy Coaching will be conducted with teachers based on a multi-tiered systems of support (Tier 1- All teachers through Professional Learning Communities, Tier 2 interventions, Tier 3 Remediation of Literacy Benchmarks and Expectations.) | priscilla.green@polk-fl.net       |

**Title I Requirements****Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))**

List the school's webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

During Open House the SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP will be shared with families. Throughout the year, we will provide families with an update on how our school is performing in comparison to our SIP goals. All of this information will also be provided in student's home language. We will also share this information with our stakeholders at SAC meetings. Title I information can be found on our website, <https://kes.polkschoolsfl.com/>.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.**

List the school's webpage\* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We have Open House plus two academic nights, one per semester. Families are encouraged to attend and learn fun and engaging ways to help their child in school. We are opening up our campus to volunteers and we encourage families to come and have lunch with their students. <https://kes.polkschoolsfl.com/>



**Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))**

We are focusing this year on high impact instruction through the use of instructional coaching. Our coaches will be completing coaching cycles with identified teachers to strengthen their instruction. Our behavior interventionist will be working with identified students in targeted areas to meet school PBIS expectations. Our ELA and Math Interventionists will be working with targeted students in both areas to increase student proficiency.

**If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))**

Our SIP was developed during our Summer Leadership Academy and during Title I technical assistance meetings to include all the Federal, State and local programs available to our school.

#### **Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

**Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))**

We have a behavioral interventionists who works with identified students to reinforce school expectations and targeted behaviors. Our school-based mental health service team including school psychologists, mental health facilitator and social worker have open communication in regards to referring students and also assisting in supporting teacher with identified students.

**Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))**

We hold an annual transition event for students moving up a grade and entering kindergarten. We encourage our 5th graders to attend the transition events at their local middle school to learn about the career academies and various programs available to them at the middle school level.

**Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).**

Tier 1- Sanford Harmony lessons and resources are taught and utilized daily. All teachers are expected to utilize this social-emotional learning resource in their classrooms. After repeated expectations are broken or misbehaviors occur, students are referred to Tier 2 and meet with our behavioral interventionist. He will work with students to address problem behaviors and redirect early before it becomes a Tier 3 issue. Tier 3- We ask for assistance from our mental health team to work on providing the student with available counseling resources both in and out of school, check-in/check-out with a teacher mentor and even assist families in finding resources to utilize outside of school.



**Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))**

At Kathleen Elementary our teachers, coaches and administrators have weekly PLCs where we discuss benchmarks, student growth towards those benchmarks through data discussions and way to support students with interventions through the use of our math and reading interventionist paid for by UNISIG. Highly Effective teachers are encouraged to come work at Kathleen Elementary with a stipend for working in a low performing school.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))**

We have an ESE Pre-K and headstart program on our campus which allows for those students to be in a school environment daily. They are familiar with the administration and staff members as they see them daily around the school. Families are encouraged to attend the Kindergarten Round-Up transition event where they can meet the teachers, see the classrooms and learn more about the daily schedule their student will follow.

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

|   |          |   |   |                |     |              |
|---|----------|---|---|----------------|-----|--------------|
| 1 | III.B.   | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment  |   |                |     | \$0.00       |
| 2 | III.B.   | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning |   |                |     | \$205,974.84 |
|   | Function | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24      |
|   | 5100     | 130   | 1221 - Kathleen Elementary School   | UniSIG         | 2.0 | \$106,806.84 |
|   |          |   | Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - School-based paid Interventionist, Math and Reading, who work with small groups of students in need of remediation.                      |                |     |              |
|   | 5100     | 150   | 1221 - Kathleen Elementary School   | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$24,165.17  |
|   |          |   | Notes: Aides Paraprofessionals - Salaries - Classroom Paraprofessional - who work under the direct supervision of a teacher to work with small groups of students in need of remediation. |                |     |              |
|   | 5100     | 210   | 1221 - Kathleen Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$17,733.70  |
|   |          |   | Notes: Retirement - 13.57% - Instructional Personnel  |                |     |              |
|   | 5100     | 220   | 1221 - Kathleen Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$9,997.26   |
|   |          |   | Notes: Social Security -7.65% -Instructional personnel  |                |     |              |
|   | 5100     | 231   | 1221 - Kathleen Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$33,084.00  |
|   |          |   | Notes: Health and Hospitalization - Instructional Personnel   |                |     |              |

|  |      |     |  |        |               |                     |
|--|------|-----|--|--------|---------------|---------------------|
|  | 5100 | 232 | 1221 - Kathleen Elementary School  | UniSIG |               | \$64.80             |
|  |      |     | <i>Notes: Life Insurance - Instructional personnel</i>   |        |               |                     |
|  | 5100 | 240 | 1221 - Kathleen Elementary School  | UniSIG |               | \$731.83            |
|  |      |     | <i>Notes: Workers Compensation - .56% - Instructional Personnel</i>  |        |               |                     |
|  | 6400 | 160 | 1221 - Kathleen Elementary School  | UniSIG | 0.14          | \$9,703.63          |
|  |      |     | <i>Notes: Cost sharing- Senior Coordinator of Instruction - individual will support multiple schools focusing on student learning by providing support and assistance to teachers and school-based administration. Provides extensive support and coaching services related to content-area instruction.</i> |        |               |                     |
|  | 6400 | 210 | 1221 - Kathleen Elementary School  | UniSIG |               | \$1,333.74          |
|  |      |     | <i>Notes: Retirement - 13.57% - Instructional Personnel</i>  |        |               |                     |
|  | 6400 | 220 | 1221 - Kathleen Elementary School  | UniSIG |               | \$751.89            |
|  |      |     | <i>Notes: Social Security - 7.65% - Instructional personnel for extended learning</i>  |        |               |                     |
|  | 6400 | 231 | 1221 - Kathleen Elementary School  | UniSIG |               | \$1,543.92          |
|  |      |     | <i>Notes: Health and Hospitalization - Instructional Personnel</i>   |        |               |                     |
|  | 6400 | 232 | 1221 - Kathleen Elementary School  | UniSIG |               | \$3.02              |
|  |      |     | <i>Notes: Life Insurance - Instructional personnel</i>   |        |               |                     |
|  | 6400 | 240 | 1221 - Kathleen Elementary School  | UniSIG |               | \$55.04             |
|  |      |     | <i>Notes: Workers Compensation -.56% - Instructional personnel for extended learning</i>   |        |               |                     |
|  |      |     |  |        | <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$205,974.84</b> |

### Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes