

Pinellas County Schools

Mildred Helms Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 26 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 26 |

Mildred Helms Elementary School

561 CLEARWATER LARGO RD S, Largo, FL 33770

<http://www.mildred-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Shannon Brennan

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | <i>[Data Not Available]</i> |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (39%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| ESSA Status | [not available] |

* 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 Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mildred Helms Elementary International Baccalaureate (IB) World School is committed to developing knowledgeable, inquiring, caring and internationally minded lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success - Each learner will achieve a year's worth of growth in a year.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Brennan, Shannon | Principal | Principal / IB Head of School |
| Deoliveira, Mary | Assistant Principal | AP, PBIS Coordinator |
| Ovalle, Michelle | Other | MTSS Coach Coordinator MTSS |
| Hubbard, Emily | Psychologist | School Psychologist |
| Riser, Mary | Teacher, K-12 | Team Leader - Teacher grade 1 |
| Yuncker, Jerrie | Teacher, K-12 | Team Leader - Teacher Grade 3 |
| Gleeson, Erin | Teacher, K-12 | Teacher - SBLT member |
| Carlson, Ana | Teacher, K-12 | Team Leaders - RP trainer |
| Smith, Kim | Administrative Support | School Secretary/ SAC Member |
| Campogni, Francine | Teacher, K-12 | Team Leader- Grade 5 |
| Enlow, Kristin | Teacher, K-12 | Team Leader - Grade 4 |
| Lannon, Lisa | Teacher, K-12 | Team Leader - Grade 2 |
| Ingram, Jennifer | Guidance Counselor | School Counselor |
| Gomez-Nieto, Gabriel | Teacher, K-12 | Team Leader - ELL |
| Phoenix, Lori | Teacher, ESE | Team Leader - ESE |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, Shannon Brennan

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

530

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

5

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

9

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 | 53 | 91 | 99 | 96 | 93 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 509 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 24 | 31 | 29 | 19 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

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 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/12/2021

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 | 56 | 102 | 92 | 111 | 83 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 534 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 23 | 26 | 30 | 20 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

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

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

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 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 56 | 102 | 92 | 111 | 83 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 534 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 23 | 26 | 30 | 20 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

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

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

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 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 49% | | | 44% | 54% | 57% | 47% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 43% | | | 43% | 59% | 58% | 46% | 47% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | | | 32% | 54% | 53% | 43% | 40% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 55% | | | 54% | 61% | 63% | 56% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 41% | | | 49% | 61% | 62% | 57% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 26% | | | 38% | 48% | 51% | 47% | 42% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 41% | | | 46% | 53% | 53% | 51% | 57% | 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 | 54% | 56% | -2% | 58% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 56% | -17% | 58% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 54% | -15% | 56% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -39% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 62% | 7% | 62% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 64% | -20% | 64% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -69% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 60% | -16% | 60% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -44% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 54% | -10% | 53% | -9% |
| 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 tool for ELA and Math for grades 1-5 is MAP data for Fall, Winter and Spring. Grade 5 science is based on district cycle 1 (Fall) and cycle 2 (Winter) assessments.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 51 / 56% | 43 / 46% | 45 / 46% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 33 / 59% | 25 / 42% | 24 / 40% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4 / 33% | 2 / 17% | 2 / 17% |
| | English Language Learners | 9 / 56% | 2 / 13% | 3 / 18% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 45 / 46% | 45 / 48% | 47 / 48% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 24 / 40% | 25 / 43% | 27 / 45% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2 / 17% | 3 / 25% | 4 / 33% |
| | English Language Learners | 3 / 18% | 4 / 24% | 4 / 24% |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 23 / 29% | 29 / 33% | 26 / 29% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 10 / 19% | 15 / 25% | 14 / 23% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 / 0 | 1 / 10% | 0 / 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 1 / 14% | 1 / 13% | 0 / 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 35 / 43% | 29 / 33% | 31 / 34% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17 / 31% | 17 / 28% | 16 / 26% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1 / 10% | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 2 / 29% | 0 / 0 | 1 / 13% |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 54 / 53% | 55 / 52% | 51 / 48% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 24 / 41% | 25 / 40% | 26 / 41% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4 / 25% | 4 / 24% | 2 / 12% |
| | English Language Learners | 2 / 22% | 2 / 20% | 3 / 30% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 56 / 55% | 59 / 57% | 60 / 58% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 22 / 38% | 26 / 43% | 28 / 44% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6 / 38% | 6 / 38% | 5 / 31% |
| | English Language Learners | 1 / 11% | 3 / 33% | 3 / 33% |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 38 / 53% | 30 / 41% | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 23 / 52% | 17 / 38% | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2 / 22% | 2 / 22% | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 2 / 29% | 1 / 14% | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 29 / 40% | 29 / 40% | 34 / 45% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16 / 36% | 14 / 31% | 17 / 38% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 2 / 29% | 2 / 29% | 2 / 29% |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 33 / 38% | 37 / 42% | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16 / 31% | 16 / 30% | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2 / 15% | 3 / 23% | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 3 / 16% | 4 / 21% | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 36 / 42% | 28 / 32% | 31 / 34% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16 / 32% | 11 / 21% | 14 / 25% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3 / 23% | 3 / 23% | 2 / 15% |
| | English Language Learners | 5 / 26% | 2 / 11% | 3 / 16% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 73 / 84% | 79 / 91% | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 40 / 78% | 45 / 87% | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 / 62% | 9 / 69% | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 15 / 79% | 16 / 84% | 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 | 21 | 40 | 50 | 33 | 27 | | 13 | | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 40 | | 38 | 27 | | 24 | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | 35 | | 39 | 35 | | 19 | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | 26 | | 50 | 26 | | 29 | | | | |
| MUL | 41 | | | 48 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 61 | | 65 | 52 | | 52 | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 42 | 43 | 47 | 39 | 31 | 26 | | | | |
| 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 | 12 | 32 | 31 | 29 | 45 | 36 | 13 | | | | |
| ELL | 32 | 30 | 30 | 46 | 50 | | 29 | | | | |
| BLK | 28 | 44 | | 39 | 38 | 45 | | | | | |

| 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 |
| HSP | 41 | 37 | 45 | 43 | 34 | 30 | 39 | | | | |
| MUL | 43 | | | 71 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 44 | 19 | 64 | 63 | 42 | 52 | | | | |
| FRL | 37 | 39 | 37 | 45 | 47 | 45 | 37 | | | | |
| 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 | 23 | 30 | 40 | 23 | 39 | 50 | | | | | |
| ELL | 39 | 65 | 64 | 55 | 52 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 32 | | 41 | 64 | | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 50 | 42 | 52 | 43 | 33 | 55 | | | | |
| MUL | 20 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 48 | 40 | 64 | 64 | 53 | 63 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 46 | 45 | 52 | 53 | 45 | 53 | | | | |

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) | [not available] |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 45 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 54 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 359 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 31 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 35 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| English Language Learners | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 31 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 37 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 45 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 58 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 40 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data 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?

In ELA and math, all grade levels are trending at 40-50% proficiency except for grade 2. In science, district level assessments are above district average. ELL and ED subgroups are performing higher than the SWD subgroup.

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

The greatest need for improvement is ELA and math proficiency in incoming third grade as well as the SWD subgroup.

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 second grade students experienced setbacks during crucial learning in first grade and continued through second grade by remaining in a virtual setting for 2020-21 school year. Out of 91 students, 27 students had less than 90% attendance throughout the year. The second grade attained the lowest overall attendance rate of all grades during 2020-21 school year. Also the largest percentage of office referrals were generated by second grade. Within the SWD subgroup, 12% remained online for the entire school year. Five of the 11 students in the SWD subgroup had less than 90% attendance throughout the year. The new actions needed to address improvement include targeted academic support for the upcoming third grade students in ELA and math and problem solving and goal setting for attendance.

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

In looking at progress monitoring data from MAP scores from Fall to Spring, our current third grade students performed at their projected proficiency in ELA.

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

The contributing factors were increased collaborative planning with a veteran team who also implemented extensive targeted supports in ELA through differentiated small group instruction and focus on the standards within their IB Units of Study.

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

Increasing standards based tasks within core instruction and monitoring classroom instruction and student performance. With the use of data binders, students need to set goals, develop action plans and own their progress throughout the year on district and classroom assessments.

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.

Standards based planning and lesson implementation, including the new BEST standards, will be provided as professional development. We will also continue with the development of conceptual knowledge through inquiry and creating culturally relevant classrooms with a focus on environment and collaboration.

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

Continued professional development on data analysis, standards based planning, conceptual development and inquiry through IB Units of Inquiry and the rollout of the BEST standards. Vertical articulation between grade levels across all content areas with aligned IB Units of Inquiry.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: School wide proficiency levels are below state and district averages. Instructional practices specifically related to standards based instruction will focus on supporting teachers with research based practices that follow state adopted standards within content areas and aligned with IB.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 49% in 2020-21 to 54% as measured by FSA.

The percentage of students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 55% in 2020-21 to 60% as measured by FSA.

The percentage of student achieving Science proficiency will increase from 44% in 2020-21 to 50% as measured by the FLSSA.

Monitoring: Increased monitoring through walkthroughs, curriculum planning documents and data based discussions following assessments in each content area and across IB Programme of Inquiry.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Facilitation of ELA-specific, math-specific and science-specific PLCs and professional development during PLCs and PD workshops. Monitor instruction in the ELA block to ensure both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to research-based principles. Increase in standards aligned planning with facilitation will increase student understanding of grade level reading and writing expectations.

Implement and ensure all teachers are engaged in math and science unit planning with vertical articulation through Grades K-5 to clarify and support understanding of the standards in ELA, math and science.

Support the 5E instructional model through identification and understanding of each component in grades 1-5.

Strengthen staff ability to utilize questions to help students elaborate on content and engage in complex standards based tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Learners must attain mastery of grade level standards in order to read, comprehend and respond to grade level text through the development of skills and strategies utilizing inquiry and concept based learning. Teachers must have a clear understanding of standards and content limits in ELA, math and science to ensure students are engaged in rigorous, grade level instruction and practice.

Action Steps to Implement

*Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback. Ensure ample time is given for reading and writing in appropriate grade level text with feedback and opportunities to use feedback.

*Calendar dates for all ELA, math and science training including pre-school, monthly staff training and weekly PLCs.

*Monitor the flow of the math block for pacing to include rigorous, grade level content, purposeful practice and remediation and enrichment.

*Provide support and feedback to teachers as needed based on observations in all content areas.

*Support and utilize formal and informal assessment strategies that inform instruction in science. Identify proficiency levels and implement instructional strategies to increase conceptual understanding of key content.

*Provide professional development on conceptual based learning and engage staff in learning through the lens of a gifted learner, ELL learner and student with disabilities.

Person Responsible Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The percentage of African American students achieving proficiency in ELA in grades 3-5 is 26% based on 2020 scores.

Measureable Outcome: The percentage of African American/Black students achieving proficiency in ELA will increase by 10% as measured by FSA.

Monitoring: The area of focus will be monitored using formative and summative district and classroom assessments followed by score analysis to determine progress. The SBLT team and MTSS Coach will work alongside teachers to determine appropriate monitoring tools and plans for intervention and identification of students who qualify for additional enrichment programs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Ovalle (ovallem@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Increase the implementation of culturally relevant instructional practices and materials within classrooms. Implement universal screening of gifted identification to expand the number of African American/Black students in the Talented development and Gifted Programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If curriculum was more engaging and culturally relevant, the problem would be reduced, and African American/ Black student performance would increase by 10%. This specific focus will impact all students positively by providing more engaging instruction as well as building their cultural competency.

Action Steps to Implement

- *Monitor African American/Black student performance utilizing all data points to analyze trend data and provide feedback to staff on plans for students not meeting proficiency and grade level expectations.
- *Check Advanced Studies report for staff attendance in AVID Culturally Responsive Teaching Training. Encourage all teachers to complete training by end of 2021-22 school year. Teachers who have attended will be sent the flyer of upcoming Equity trainings to further their culturally relevant teaching knowledge.
- *Equity Champions and Restorative Practice Trainers will present quarterly on effective implementation of Culturally Responsive Teaching and Restorative Practices.
- *Implement universal gifted and talented screeners in primary grades.

Person Responsible Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SWD data indicated 21% of students attained proficiency on the FSA ELA assessment in 2020-21.

Measureable Outcome: SWD students were 21% proficient on the ELA FSA in 2020-21 and will increase to 40% on the 2021 -22 ELA FSA.

Monitoring: The Area of Focus will be monitored utilizing progress monitoring data as well as district and state assessment data such as MAP, iStation, and classroom formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement a process for placing students requiring ESE services in master schedules first in order to optimize service delivery, focusing on a clustering process to meet student needs.

Provide opportunities for ESE and general education students to co-plan for differentiated instruction and support delivery of services.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Clustering of students with like need and service requirements will maximize time allocations for service delivery. Increased opportunities for planning will optimize support of students needs as aligned with standards based grade level instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

*Master schedule will be built to address intervention times across the day to maximize service delivery in an inclusion model.

*Classes will be developed utilizing clustering of SWD to maximize service delivery model.

*Collaborative planning will be scheduled with ESE and general education teachers to support differentiated instruction and inclusion support with standards based tasks and grade level content.

Person Responsible Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELL student data has decreased and parent involvement has been limited in school based activities.

Measureable Outcome: Increase ELL student proficiency from 29% on ELA FSA in 2020-21 to 40% in 2021-22. Increase the number of ELL Parent Workshops to one in the Fall and a second one in the Spring. Increase communication and marketing of events to increase parent and family participation. Increase parent participation by 10% as compared to 2020-21 ELL Family Night.

Monitoring: The desired outcome will be monitored through student performance data as well as parent participation in school wide events as well as specific ELL Parent Family Nights.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Establish meaningful communication with families and parent involvement in home languages that are responsive to the cultural experiences of the EL families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Increasing parent involvement with ELL families will directly impact the academic achievement and support the home school connection and increasing the partnership of families and school.

Action Steps to Implement

- *Ensure a school wide plan for communication is enacted to support families utilizing ELL staff, bilingual assistant, district resources and LionBridge translation services.
 - *Utilize district and site based resources for parent conferences and academic engagement.
 - *Schedule and implement a fall and spring ELL Parent Night to ensure parents understand how to access resources and understand student progress on assessments and classroom performance.
- ESOL teachers will:
- meet at the start of the school year to review FSA, ACCESS for ELs and 2021 Spring ELA MAP data to determine supports for each individual EL student
 - complete the CAN DO EL student chart/grade level cluster form for each teacher with EL student information. GO TO strategies will also be given to each teacher and checking periodically ELs' language development progress using the Can-Do Descriptors to differentiate instruction appropriately
 - Collaborate with the grade-level classroom teachers in PLCs and planning and providing data-driven, comprehensible, standards-based, grade level appropriate lessons in various subject areas, and layered support in language acquisition by:
 - o utilizing the Model Performance Indicators (MPIs) to differentiate classroom instruction based on EL students' levels of English language proficiency
 - o utilizing the Linguistic Supports for Scaffolding Instruction for EL Students by Language Proficiency Levels to scaffold instruction
 - o utilizing the ELA Beginner EL lessons in the 3rd – 5th Grade ESOL Newcomers Canvas to provide ELs at a low ELP level with access to the ELA lessons
- Participate in grade level, staff and District PLCs by:
- o utilizing information on student length of time in the US and English proficiency data to compare with MAP, iStation, FSA, etc. data to determine appropriate instructional and testing accommodations and interventions

o analyzing EL subgroup data (LY, LF, LA) compared to overall population in terms of growth & expected performance to determine whether ELs are making progress & using this information to adjust student plans

*Provide instruction in flexible student grouping: whole class, small groups, or one-on-one to fosters ELs' language development through content

*Classroom teachers will intentionally plan for differentiation based on language proficiency levels, Can Do Descriptors in small group lessons, as well as during the whole-group core instruction and solicit support and input from the grade-level assigned ESOL teacher on an ongoing basis.

*EL services will be delivered through inclusion in the classroom the EL and the classroom teacher and EL sheltered instruction for those students needing additional and intensive levels of support.

*All 3-5 graders will be assigned a PCS Connects device for in class and home access to District programs.

Person Responsible Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Average daily attendance impacts student learning in all academic areas. During the 2020-21 school year, the average daily attendance was 88.4%.

Measureable Outcome: Average daily attendance will increase from 88% to 95% and the percentage of students missing 10% or more days will decrease by 10% in the 2021-22 school year.

Monitoring: Monitoring for the desired outcome will be completed in biweekly meetings of the CST team utilizing number of parent contacts, attendance conferences and TIPS referral data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mary Deoliveira (deoliveiram@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Strengthen the identification and problem solving process to address and support the needs of all students across all tiers on an ongoing basis. Strengthen the communication of actions plans and implementation of tier 2 and 3 interventions to address and support student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Strengthening the identification process early in the year will increase the likelihood of improving attendance by making contact and creating action plans with parents in one of the earliest steps of the process.

Action Steps to Implement

*Ensure accuracy of daily attendance and recording of correct entry and withdrawal codes.

*Increase parent communication and contact regarding the importance and impact of attendance on academic progress.

*Increase monitoring of Tier 2/3 students in problem solving process. Review barriers and monitor effectiveness biweekly.

Person Responsible Mary Deoliveira (deoliveiram@pcsb.org)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increased family and community engagement positively impacts both learners and the learning environment within the entire school community.

Measureable Outcome: Parent and community involvement with events, both onsite and virtual, will increase by 10% from 2020-21 to 2021-22.

Monitoring: Parent Involvement will be monitored through website interaction, Family and Parent Involvement sign in/out sheets and input forms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Increase promotion and marketing of virtual and onsite family involvement events through Class Dojo, morning news, newsletters, school messengers, school website and use of marquee.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Increased communication will encourage and increase in participation in schoolwide activities that provide both an academic focus as well as increase in parent knowledge of grade level standards and expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

- *Increase marketing of events through Class Dojo, morning news, school website, School Messenger, school newsletter and marquee.
- *Increase timely communication of events with staff and families and ensure all events are on the school calendar.
- *Family and Community Liaison and SAC Chair attend the annual Hooked on Family Engagement conference.

Person Responsible Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: An inclusive, supportive classroom environment is an essential condition for learning. Engagement and achievement thrive in a classroom culture where students' assets, interests, experiences, perspectives and cultural funds of knowledge are valued and intentionally reflected in curriculum materials and learning experiences.

Measureable Outcome: At the end of the 2021-22 school year, the risk ratio for African American/Black students will be reduced to less than 1.0 or below as measured by the Schools Profile Behavior Dashboard. For 2021- 22, there will be a reduction of calls to the office for behavior support as measured by the average calls per day on the classroom behavior call log.

Monitoring: Office Discipline Referrals and classroom behavior call log will be monitored on a biweekly basis with the SBLT Behavior Team. Behavior data will be shared at monthly staff meetings and PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mary Deoliveira (deoliveiram@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: If behavior expectations for students are clearly defined, communicated, agreed upon, implemented by staff and explicitly taught to students and parents, the problem will be reduced by students and parents understanding what is expected of them. Provide professional development in culturally responsive teaching, PBIS and Restorative Practices to staff and families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Engaging staff and families in dialogue centered on culturally responsive practices, PBIS and Restorative Practices will provide an understanding of foundational strategies within our school that support the knowledge of school wide expectations, Guidelines for Success, and core values.

Action Steps to Implement

*Prior to the first day of school with students, the PBIS Coordinator will use the Tier 1 Walkthrough Tool to ensure signage reflecting revised Guidelines for Success (expectations) is posted in common areas and to evaluate evidence of classroom PBIS systems alignment to schoolwide practices.

*Beginning with the first day of school, classroom teachers will greet students at the door by their name as they enter the class. Leadership will conduct walkthroughs to ensure that implementation/greeting is occurring with consistency.

*All classroom teachers will conduct weekly (minimum) community building circles or class meetings to establish a "culture of care" to focus on positive relationships, interactions, sharing class responsibility, growing empathy, establishing use of "I" statements to express feelings, demonstrating and practicing active listening and use of affective language.

Person Responsible Mary Deoliveira (deoliveiram@pcsb.org)

#8. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | As evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation School Program, our current level of performance is Bronze. |
| Measureable Outcome: | MHES will maintain our Bronze level status as evidenced by the Alliance or a Healthier Generation Schools Program Framework. Our school will begin to work towards Silver eligibility by fulfilling required components to achieve Silver status. |
| Monitoring: | The Healthy Schools Team will monitor progress at all grade levels and track staff training through the 2021-22 school year. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Mary Deoliveira (deoliveiram@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | The Healthy Schools Team goal will be to provide support to implement school wide wellness goals and maintain the Bronze level components. For the 2021-22 school year, our staff will be required to attend a professional development session on promoting and integrating physical activity in the classroom. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | The Healthy Schools Team will provide additional supports to implement an action plan aligned with the school wide wellness plan to positively impact staff and student wellness and attendance. |

Action Steps to Implement

- *Convene the Healthy Schools Team during preschool to select an appropriate online course focusing on increasing physical activity in the classroom with approval of administration.
- *The Healthy Schools Team will communicate the details of the course with staff during preschool training.
- *The Healthy Schools Team will monitor course progress throughout the year to ensure completion by all staff before the end of the 2021-22 school year.

Person Responsible Mary Deoliveira (deoliveiram@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

The school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior and discipline data by using equity centered problem solving practices, analyzing current levels of performance, identifying performance gaps and developing action plans with continuous monitoring. While our overall school incidents were reported at .9 incidents per 100 students, our incident and suspension rates were less than the statewide elementary rates.

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.

- *Continue to develop a culturally responsive environment that values and represents all members of our learning community.
- *Develop learning communities that promote a positive and safe learning environment ensuring that people understand their roles and relationships to student learning.
- *Educate all stakeholders on the components and connections of equity within home and school environments.
- *Develop parent chats to gain input on the school environment and workshop to share school wide resources and tools as well as IB programme requirements and curriculum connections to educate all stakeholders including specific parent nights for SWD and ELL subgroups..
- *Establish relationships with community members and local business partners to support school wide goals.

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

- *Leadership Teams will develop the school improvement plan with input from stakeholders that address the components of a positive culture and environment, ensure that all staff have been provided professional development necessary to implement the plan and monitor the implementation.
- *Student Services/SBLT - Provide professional development including lesson plans that support plan implementation. Provide tier system of supports to teachers and students throughout implementation.
- *Staff will provide input and feedback on plan and implementation throughout the 2021-22 school year.
- *Students will provide input and feedback through implementation and abide by school wide expectations.
- *Parents and community members will provide input and feedback through implementation and support the school through daily interactions with school community.

Part V: Budget

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | | | | \$129,250.00 |
|---|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----|--------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 2431 - Mildred Helms Elem. School | Title, I Part A | | \$31,935.96 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Hourly teacher/paraprofessional support</i> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----|-------------------|
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2431 - Mildred Helms Elem. School | Title, I Part A | | \$2,009.11 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Instructional Materials</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 612-Library Books for Existing Libraries | 2431 - Mildred Helms Elem. School | Title, I Part A | | \$500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Classroom library books</i> | | | |
| | 6300 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 2431 - Mildred Helms Elem. School | Title, I Part A | | \$5,745.60 |
| | | | <i>Notes: SIP - contract services for PD</i> | | | |
| | 6300 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 2431 - Mildred Helms Elem. School | Title, I Part A | | \$957.60 |
| | | | <i>Notes: SIP Contract Services and Program Coordination</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 2431 - Mildred Helms Elem. School | Title, I Part A | | \$86,101.73 |
| | | | <i>Notes: MTSS/RTI Coach</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 330-Travel | 2431 - Mildred Helms Elem. School | Title, I Part A | | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: PD Conference Registrations</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American | | | | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | | | | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners | | | | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | | | | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement | | | | \$5,708.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 6150 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 2431 - Mildred Helms Elem. School | Title, I Part A | | \$2,760.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Child care for Parent Workshops/Conferences</i> | | | |
| | 6150 | 330-Travel | 2431 - Mildred Helms Elem. School | Title, I Part A | | \$200.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Registration Fees for Hooked on Family Engagement Conference</i> | | | |
| | 6150 | | 2431 - Mildred Helms Elem. School | Title, I Part A | | \$48.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Postage for Parent Communicaiton</i> | | | |
| | 6150 | 510-Supplies | 2431 - Mildred Helms Elem. School | Title, I Part A | | \$2,700.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Instructional Materials/Agenda Books and Central Printing of compacts</i> | | | |
| 7 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity | | | | \$2,650.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 6400 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 2431 - Mildred Helms Elem. School | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,650.00 |

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| | | <i>Notes: Professional Development</i> | |
| 8 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$137,608.00 |