

Pinellas County Schools

Lealman Avenue Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 7 |
| Planning for Improvement | 12 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 30 |

Lealman Avenue Elementary School

4001 58TH AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33714

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

Demographics

Principal: Kristen Sulte G

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

| | |
|--|--|
| 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) | 100% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| School Grade | 2018-19: D |
| School Grades History | 2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: D 2013-14: D |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Tracy Webley |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | TIER 1 |

| ESSA Status | CS&I |
|--|------|
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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

Lealman Avenue Elementary commits to creating a safe, collaborative and caring environment. With focus on organization, determination and challenging work, our scholars will be valued and held accountable for their learning and academic growth.

Provide the school's vision statement

Our Vision- 100% Student Success

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name | Title |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Duffy, Kim | Principal |
| Principal | |
| Mavres, Annette | Assistant Principal |
| Assistant Principal | |
| Hubble, Karen | Instructional Coach |
| Instructional Coach | |
| Turgeon, Katelyn | Instructional Coach |
| Instructional Coach | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Number of students enrolled | 67 | 68 | 76 | 64 | 80 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 419 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 2 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |

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 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

24

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/15/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------|--|
| Attendance below 90 percent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| One or more suspensions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------|--|
| Students with two or more indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 30 | 26 | 17 | 24 | 19 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |

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 | 22 | 19 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 32% | 54% | 57% | 33% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 39% | 59% | 58% | 38% | 47% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 34% | 54% | 53% | 38% | 40% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 39% | 61% | 63% | 48% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 40% | 61% | 62% | 54% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 29% | 48% | 51% | 31% | 42% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 30% | 53% | 53% | 46% | 57% | 55% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 67 (0) | 68 (0) | 76 (0) | 64 (0) | 80 (0) | 64 (0) | 419 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 () | 2 () | 11 () | 6 () | 1 () | 5 () | 33 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 22 (0) | 23 (0) | 45 (0) |

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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 |
| 03 | 2019 | 35% | 56% | -21% | 58% | -23% |
| | 2018 | 29% | 53% | -24% | 57% | -28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 31% | 56% | -25% | 58% | -27% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 51% | -9% | 56% | -14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 28% | 54% | -26% | 56% | -28% |
| | 2018 | 29% | 50% | -21% | 55% | -26% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -14% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 45% | 62% | -17% | 62% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 62% | -17% | 62% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 43% | 64% | -21% | 64% | -21% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 62% | -14% | 62% | -14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 25% | 60% | -35% | 60% | -35% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 61% | -11% | 61% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -25% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -23% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 30% | 54% | -24% | 53% | -23% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 57% | -11% | 55% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 5 | | | 5 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 45 | 47 | | 41 | 60 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 47 | 55 | | 47 | 45 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 39 | 31 | 30 | 22 | 14 | 26 | | | | |
| HSP | 26 | 40 | | 38 | 52 | | 36 | | | | |
| WHT | 36 | 35 | | 44 | 46 | 27 | 28 | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 34 | 27 | 38 | 37 | 23 | 26 | | | | |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 7 | 23 | 40 | 29 | 45 | 38 | 17 | | | | |
| ELL | 44 | 50 | | 58 | 63 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 57 | 75 | | 79 | 75 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 31 | 31 | 44 | 46 | 17 | 30 | | | | |
| HSP | 45 | 46 | | 53 | 57 | | 46 | | | | |
| WHT | 28 | 32 | 54 | 44 | 56 | 46 | 50 | | | | |
| FRL | 34 | 37 | 40 | 47 | 54 | 31 | 43 | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | CS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students | 38 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 57 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 300 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 5 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 50 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Asian Students | |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 49 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Black/African American Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 27 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 41 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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 | 36 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 34 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Our overall reading proficiency is stagnate and not showing growing it is at 32% our gains in English Language Arts are showing a downward trend at 39%. Our Lowest 25% in English Language Arts are also showing a decline at 39%. All retained students in grade 3 made gains, Our grade 4 over all gains were at 48% grade 4 Lowest 25% were at 41% and grade 5 overall gains were 36% and Lowest 25% grade 5 were 31%. There is a significant gap that appears at the end of 1st grade, data indicates that some gains are made, but by the time they reach the intermediate grades the deficit increases as reflected in Florida Standards Assessment scores.

Over all Math proficiency was 39% over all math total gains 40% and Lowest 25% gains 29%. All retained 3rd graders made growth. In 4th grade 56% of out students made gains overall, with 50% of the Lowest 25% making gains, In grade 5 22% made over all gains, 0% of our Lowest 25% made gains. This is a huge disconnect reflected in our 5th grade instruction and scores.

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

In science we declined to 30% proficiency of our 5th grade students from 46% proficient in 2108. The nature of science scores were low on the Science Standards Assessment due to lack of exposure and mastery of the standards. The science scores are aligned the 5th grade English Language A which was at 28% proficient.

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

In looking at the state data compared to our data in English Language Arts, Math and Science we are about 25 points below the state average. We view this as a reading issue, since our English Language Arts and science are closely aligned. Students who cannot read and comprehend lack sufficient skills to apply needed strategies to successfully perform on these assessments.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was our English Language Learners students who went from 33% proficiency in English Language Arts in 2018 to 45% proficiency in 2019, with 47% of our English Language Learners students making learning gains. In math 41% of our English Language Learners students were proficient in 2018 with 68% of the students making learning math gains. We used writing and reading routines and journaling in or intermediate classes with our English Language Learners teacher monitoring for comprehension. There was an intentional plan to include below and on level texts to balance comprehension and meaningful engagement with monitoring.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Our attendance is an area of concern, 39% of our black subgroup was absent 10% or more days (60 students). 26% of our white subgroup was absent 10% or more days (52 students). That is 112 students out of 450 students, that is about 25% of our population missing school.

Our low test scores grade 4 is at 51% of level 1 in English Language Arts/Math, in grade 5 is at 49% in level 1 in English Language Arts/Math.

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

1. Attendance
2. English Language Arts: small group guided reading with fidelity, planned preparedness and fidelity for implementation of English Language Arts modules,
3. Math: structured alignment of the math block to include: number routines, rich mathematical tasks emphasis on the 8 standard mathematical practices, rigorous tasks, responsive and guiding questions and aligned assessments.
4. Science: punctuate the nature of science, grade 4 and 5 science diagnostic in the fall to create a plan for review and look for mastery of grade level 3 and 4 standards.
5. Professional Development:
English Language Arts coach in the Daily 5, small group guided reading and intentional planning for rigor, monitoring and adjustment on the spot teaching.
Science lab/coach to model structured lessons within the science lab, monitor and disaggregate on going data, purposeful planning within structured Professional Learning Communities, coaching cycles K-5.
Math coach will support planning based on anticipatory practice with planned questions to drive student owned learning (monitoring and adjustment on the spot), will model structured lessons with in the math core, purposeful planning with Standard Mathematical Practices with release to rigor.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | |
|--|--|
| #1 | |
| Title | Bridging the Gap |
| Rationale | <p>Black students are currently a failing subgroup. Their overall English Language Arts proficiency was at 25%, learning gains at 39% and the lowest 25% at 14% in English Language Arts. Math gains were at 22%. Science proficiency was at 26%. This group has an achievement gap when comparing to the performance of white students and performance overall.</p> <p>39% of this subgroup (60 students) is absent 10% or more of the school year.</p> |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | <p>Black students will achieve proficiency on Florida Standards Assessment in English Language Arts, English Language Arts Gains, English Language Arts Lowest 25%, Math, Math Gains and Math Lowest 25% and science.</p> <p>Attendance Rates will increase to that of non-black rate with an overall goal of 10% missing school.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Annette Mavres (mavresa@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Use of Culturally Responsive Teaching Strategies to foster a inviting climate and culture in which our scholars to learn and perform and achieve success. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Culturally Responsive Teaching empowers students educationally and expands their capabilities socially and emotionally by making students' own skills, languages, and attitudes meaningful in the classroom. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <p>1. Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on culturally relevant strategies to increase engagement and improve pass rates and grade point averages for black students. Teachers will be able to implement Culturally Responsive Teaching with ease in their daily lessons across all subjects, but especially in English Language Arts. Their awareness of the needs of Black students will increase, and they will be better equipped to build stronger, positive relationships with black students and families. This will lead to increase scores on Florida Standards Assessment.</p> <p>2. Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback. Black students will be more engaged in learning, motivated to complete work and develop stronger</p> |

relationships with
teachers and classmates.

3. Ensure black students are participating in extended learning opportunities before and after school and in extended school year programs through recruitment and targeted resources. By ensuring black students' participation in English Language Arts and Math Extended Learning Plan, students learning gaps will be able to filled in a smaller group setting without then having to lose time during the core.
4. Ensure staff has access to data specific to black students in order to have effective data chats and targeted support for improved learning. By looking closely at the academic data of black students, teachers will be able to adjust their instruction accordingly.
5. Provide support and professional development in Restorative Practices, especially circles and Social Emotional Learning.

**Person
Responsible**

Annette Mavres (mavresa@pcsb.org)

| | |
|--|--|
| #2 | |
| Title | English Language Arts /Reading Goal |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is at 32% proficiency or above, as evidenced in Florida Standards Assessment. Our Learning gains in English Language Arts are at 39% and the Lowest 25% are at 34% proficient. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | The percent of all students achieving proficiency on English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessment will increase from 32% to 55% , as measured by Florida Standards Assessment. The percent of all students making a learning gains on English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessment will increase from 39% to 55%. The percent of lowest 25% making a learning gains on English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessment will increase from 34% to 55%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kim Duffy (duffyki@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above the benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | This strategy was selected due to our English Language Arts proficiency scores that have had a decline in over the past 3 years in learning gains and learning gain of the Lowest 25%. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers align instruction to meet the Florida Standards for English Language Arts, district curriculum guidelines and students needs by providing multiple opportunities across the literacy block for reading, writing, speaking and listening. 2. Teachers intentionally plan instruction aligned with a high level of rigor by using Webb’s Depth of Knowledge/Marzano’s Taxonomy and adjust instruction through the use of talk, task, text and student needs. 3. While students are practicing, teachers observe, take notes and confer with students in individual or small groups to probe for understanding and provide targeted, actionable, feedback. 4. Teachers will learn different ways to scaffold students so that all students can access grade level, complex text. during the core. They will develop an understanding of the shifts of instruction through the use of Achievement Network and additional Professional Development, and utilize various strategies including close reading, strategy instruction, thinking maps, and text annotation to assist scholars in their thinking. |

5. Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth.

**Person
Responsible**

Kim Duffy (duffyki@pcsb.org)

| | |
|--|--|
| #3 | |
| Title | Math Goal |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is at 39% proficient as evidenced on the Math Florida Standards Assessment. Our learning gains in math are 40% and our learning gains in Lowest 25% are 29% in math. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | The percent of all students achieving proficiency on Math Florida Standards Assessment will increase from 39% to 55%, as measured by the Math Florida Standards Assessment. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kim Duffy (duffyki@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, iReady, and Number Routines. Support this work through curriculum meetings, Professional Learning Communities, feedback, and/or the use of classroom video to develop conceptual knowledge in the adult learners. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | This strategy was selected due to our Math proficiency scores in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade dropping in their proficiency ratings. There was a significant dip in our 5th grade scores. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers collaborate to select and implement rigorous tasks aligned with each standard, including Mathematics Formative Assessment System (MFAS) and Rich Mathematical Tasks from the Curriculum Guides. 2. Teachers implement daily Number Routines (Number Talks, High Yield Number Routines, Maintenance Routines, etc.) at the start of the math block to increase number sense and flexibility. 3. Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning and adjust learning based on anticipatory practice on the spot. 4. Systematically use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention, and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance in a culturally relevant environment. 5. Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth. Administrators regularly observe mathematics lessons and provide feedback, with mathematics coach support as requested. |
| Person Responsible | Annette Mavres (mavresa@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|--|--|
| #4 | |
| Title | Science Goal |
| Rationale | 1. Our current level of performance is 30% at proficiency and above , as evidenced on the Science Standards Assessment. We expect our performance level to be 55% by Spring 2020. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | The percent of 5th grade students achieving proficiency on Science Standards Assessment will increase from 30% to 55%, as measured by Science Standards Assessment. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kim Duffy (duffyki@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model (10% setting the purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) and includes appropriate grade-level utilization of science labs in alignment to the 1st - 5th grade standards. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | This strategy selected was due to our Science proficiency scores on Science Standards Assessment in 5th grade going from 46% proficient in the 17-18 school year to 30% proficient in the 18-19 school year. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers collaborate to select and implement rigorous tasks aligned with each standard, through an emphasis on the nature of science through each module of study. 2. Utilize diagnostic data to align instructional resources to support the ongoing review and expansion of learning with an emphasis on informational text and academic vocabulary. 3. Ensure 4th and 5th grade students take diagnostic assessment in September and utilize item analysis to identify lowest 3rd and 4th grade standards for Life, Physical, Earth and Nature Of Science to plan for review and mastery. 4. Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning inclusive of the 'Confirming the Learning' portion of the instructional model to ensure mastery as the unit unfolds. 5. Administrators monitor assessment data, lesson planning and teacher practice to provide feedback to support teacher growth. Administrators regularly observe science lessons and provide feedback, with science coach support as requested. |
| Person Responsible | Annette Mavres (mavresa@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|--|---|
| #5 | |
| Title | Conditions for Learning |
| Rationale | 1. Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 40 referrals. We expect our performance level to be 30 referrals by May 2020. The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because there is a need to focus upon social emotional learning for students in a culturally responsive classroom. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | The number of all students receiving referrals will decrease from 29 to 20, as measured by referral data. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kim Duffy (duffyki@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Every teacher and school-based staff engages in strategies and supports that the academic, social-emotional and behavioral needs of each and every student are known and met. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | This strategy was selected was due to the needs of our students and the results of the comprehensive needs assessment. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop and implement a school wide behavior plan with clear guidelines, positive reinforcements, 2. School Based Leadership Team will follow a monitoring calendar to provide feedback on the guidelines and processes. 3. Use Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) Culturally Responsive Teaching strategies 4. Routine monitoring of the behavior indicators by the School Based Leadership Team. 5. Provide professional development in response to the trends of data. |
| Person Responsible | Annette Mavres (mavresa@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|--|--|
| #6 | |
| Title | Attendance |
| Rationale | 28% of the population were absent 10% of the year 9% of the population were absent 20% of the year 5% received perfect attendance Overall Attendance Rate for All Scholars was 93.5% |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | Our goal is to reduce the percentage of students missing 10% or more to 17%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Annette Mavres (mavresa@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | We will engage students and parents, recognize good and improved attendance, provide personalized outreach, monitor daily attendance data and practice to reduce absences. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | This strategy was selected because every day a student is absent is a lost opportunity for learning. Absences not only affect for the absent student but is also disruptive to the learning of the entire class. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incorporate Attendance into Positive Behavior Intervention Support school-wide system. 2. Create Parent Awareness and Communication through First Day Packet, Agenda, Back to School Night. 3. Staff training on plan and attendance procedures during preschool 4. Monthly Recognition for students with Perfect Attendance (No absences and two tardies) - Charm Program-First month with Perfect attendance is Charm- Perfect Attendance- subsequent charms are Attendance Stars -Students will be recognized on the Morning News Program- Names 5. A minimum of 3 times a year Child Study Team will problem solve to review and adjust tier one plan |
| Person Responsible | Kim Duffy (duffyki@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|--|--|
| #7 | |
| Title | Family and Community Engagement |
| Rationale | Lealman Avenue Elementary will establish a working relationship with parents and caregivers that is essential to all students' achievement and therefore encourages parental involvement in all school activities. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | We will increase parental involvement and attendance at our family events to 50% as measured by parent sign in sheets from the events. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Karen Hubble (hubblek@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | We will strengthen the voice of families by bringing focus to the needs of the students so that each student will reach their full academic and social potential. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | This strategy was selected from our comprehensive needs survey showed a need for an increase in parental involvement. When families and schools work together students are more successful. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We will develop a calendar of events that include a wide variety of activities that appeals to all families. 2. Develop a plan for parent and family notification of upcoming events. 3. We are going to include take home items at each event that families can use to support extended learning. 4. We will develop a flexible conference schedule for families to meet with their child's teacher. 5. We will hold connect for success nights to ensure that families have the opportunity to sign out a computer for use at home for their student. |
| Person Responsible | Karen Hubble (hubblek@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|--|---|
| #8 | |
| Title | Healthy Schools |
| Rationale | Develop and sustain a healthy, respectful, caring and safe learning environment for students, staff, and community members. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | We will engage in wellness efforts through the Alliance for Healthier Generation Schools Program. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kim Duffy (duffyki@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Our Wellness Champion, cafeteria manager, physical education department, and district wellness consultant will work together to monitor assessments and promote our healthy schools program. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | This strategy was selected because we have earned the bronze level recognition of healthy and we want to increase to the silver level of recognition. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Healthy School team will review all assessment items to determine the most feasible items to improve in one module at a time to achieve recognition level, and then develop an action plan for that item. 2. Physical Education Department implemented a "Mileage" club for scholars to walk/run laps and earn charms for every mile they completed 3. The Wellness Committee provides healthy snacks for staff during staff meetings. 4. Monthly Wellness Committee meetings will occur. |
| Person Responsible | Kim Duffy (duffyki@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|--|--|
| #9 | |
| Title | ESSA - Students With Disabilities |
| Rationale | Our Students With Disabilities subgroup is currently a failing subgroup. There is a significant achievement gap in their performance when compared to that of non-Students With Disabilities students. Their overall proficiency in English Language Arts was 5%, there were no learning gains or Lowest 25% learning gains in English Language Arts. Math proficiency was at 5%, there were no learning gains or Lowest 25% learning gains in Math. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | The overall proficiency of Students With Disabilities students on English Language Art and Math Florida Standards Assessment as well as Science Standards Assessment will increase to 45% and the overall learning gains and learning gains of the Students With Disabilities students in the Lowest 25% will also move to 45%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kim Duffy (duffyki@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <p>Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for Students With Disabilities, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.</p> <p>Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, iReady Mathematics, and Number Routines. Support this work through curriculum meetings, Professional Learning Communities, feedback, and/or the use of classroom video.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Our Students With Disabilities students are not growing in either English Language Arts or Math in proficiency. The gap begins in primary and widens as the students move to the intermediate grade levels. |

Action Step

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work with Students With Disabilities teachers in writing the master schedule to ensure that supports can be provided to students both in and out of core. 2. Collect data and monitor progress towards Individualized Education Plan goals and ensure collaboration between the Students With Disabilities and general education teachers to best support students. Gradually reduce Students With Disabilities supports to foster student independence as needed. 3. Plan intentionally for specially designed instruction to address Individualized Education Plan goals and grade level standards. Use evidence-based practices for students with disabilities to teach foundational literacy and math skills as a pathway to grade level work. 4. Provide differentiated individualized and/or small group instruction aligned |
|--------------------|--|

to grade level standards and break down complex instructions and skill for students. Use visual supports and prompts to support students through transitions and longer tasks.

5. Utilize scaffolds such as annotated texts, sentence frames, specific works spaces, or technology to ensure that all students have access to the grade level materials alongside our Students With Disabilities Instructional Staff Developer.

**Person
Responsible**

Annette Mavres (mavresa@pcsb.org)

| | |
|--|---|
| #10 | |
| Title | ESSA- African American |
| Rationale | African American students are currently a failing subgroup. Their overall English Language Arts proficiency was at 25%, learning gains at 39% and the lowest 25% at 31% in English Language Arts. Their overall Math proficiency was at 30%, Math gains were at 22% and the lowest 25% at 14% in Math. Science proficiency was at 26%.This group has an achievement gap when comparing to the performance of white students and performance overall. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | The overall proficiency of Black students on English Language Arts and math Florida Standards Assessment as well as Science Standards Assessment will increase to 55% and the overall learning gains and learning gains of the Black students in the Lowest 25% will also move to 55%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kim Duffy (duffyki@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Facilitate English Language Arts-focused, consistent and sustained professional development with a focus on standards-based instruction, target and task alignment, and the shifts (Regular practice with complex texts and academic language; Reading, writing, & speaking grounded in evidence from texts; Building knowledge through content-rich nonfiction). |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | This strategy was selected was due to our African American students low test scores and related high absences. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on culturally relevant strategies to increase engagement and improve pass rates and grade point averages for black students. Teachers will be able to implement Culturally Relevant Teaching strategies with ease in their daily lessons across all subjects, but especially in English Language Arts. 2. Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans. Black students will be more engaged in learning, motivated to complete work and develop stronger relationships with teachers and classmates. This will lead to improved scores in English Language Arts, especially in writing, where these students tend to struggle. 3. Ensure black students are participating in extended learning opportunities before and after school and in extended school year programs through recruitment and targeted resources. 4. Provide Professional development in Advancement Via Individual |

Determination/Culturally Relevant Teaching strategies specifically to meeting the needs of black students. Model these strategies during curriculum meetings and Professional Learning Communities.
5. Provide support and professional development in Restorative Practices, especially circles and Social Emotional Learning.

Person Responsible

Kim Duffy (duffyki@pcsb.org)

| | |
|--|--|
| #11 | |
| Title | ESSA- White |
| Rationale | White students are currently a failing subgroup in English Language Arts, Math gains Lowest 25% and Science. Their overall English Language Arts proficiency was at 36%, learning gains at 35% in English Language Arts. Math Lowest 25% was at 27% Science proficiency was at 28%.This group has an achievement gap when comparing to the performance of non white students and performance overall in the state. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | The overall proficiency of White students on English Language Arts and math Florida Standards Assessment as well as Science Standards Assessment will increase to 55% and the overall learning gains and learning gains of the White students in the Lowest 25% will also move to 55%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kim Duffy (duffyki@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Facilitate English Language Arts -focused, consistent and sustained professional development with a focus on standards-based instruction, target and task alignment, and the shifts (Regular practice with complex texts and academic language; Reading, writing, & speaking grounded in evidence from texts; Building knowledge through content-rich nonfiction). Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, iReady, and Number Routines. Support this work through curriculum meetings, Professional Learning Communities, feedback, and/or the use of classroom video to develop conceptual knowledge in the adult learners. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | This strategy was selected was due to our White students low test scores and related high absences. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers align instruction to meet the Florida Standards for English Language Arts, district curriculum guidelines and students needs by providing multiple opportunities across the literacy block for reading, writing, speaking and listening. Teachers intentionally plan instruction aligned with a high level of rigor by using Webb’s Depth of Knowledge/Marzano’s Taxonomy and adjust instruction through the use of talk, task, text and student needs. 2. While students are practicing, teachers observe, take notes and confer with students in individual or small groups to probe for understanding and provide targeted, actionable, feedback. 3. Teachers will learn different ways to scaffold students so that all students can access grade level, complex |

text. during the core. They will develop an understanding of the shifts of instruction and additional PD, and utilize various strategies including close reading, strategy instruction, thinking maps, and text annotation to assist scholars in their thinking.

4. Teachers collaborate to select and implement rigorous tasks aligned with each standard, including Mathematics Formative Assessment System (MFAS) and Rich Mathematical Tasks from the Curriculum

Guides. Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning and adjust learning based on anticipatory practice on the spot.

5. Teachers implement daily Number Routines (Number Talks, High Yield Number Routines, Maintenance Routines, etc.) at the start of the math block to increase number sense and flexibility.

**Person
Responsible**

Kim Duffy (duffyki@pcsb.org)

| | |
|--|---|
| #12 | |
| Title | ESSA- Free and Reduced Lunch |
| Rationale | Our Free and Reduced Lunch students are currently a failing subgroup in English Language Arts, Math, and Science. Their overall English Language Arts proficiency was at 28%, learning gains at 34% in English Language Arts, and Lowest 25% was at 27%. Their overall math proficiency was at 38%, learning gains at 37% and Lowest 25% was at 23%. Science proficiency was at 26%. This group has an achievement gap when comparing to the performance overall in the state. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | The overall proficiency of the Free and Reduced Lunch students on English Language Arts and math Florida Standards Assessment as well as Science Standards Assessment will increase to 55% and the overall learning gains and learning gains of the Free and Reduced Lunch students in the Lowest 25% will also move to 55%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kim Duffy (duffyki@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Facilitate English Language Arts-focused, consistent and sustained professional development with a focus on standards-based instruction, target and task alignment, and the shifts (Regular practice with complex texts and academic language; Reading, writing, & speaking grounded in evidence from texts; Building knowledge through content-rich nonfiction). Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, iReady, and Number Routines. Support this work through curriculum meetings, Professional Learning Communities, feedback, and/or the use of classroom video to develop conceptual knowledge in the adult learners. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | This strategy was selected was due to our Free and Reduced Lunch students low test scores and related high absences. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers align instruction to meet the Florida Standards for English Language Arts, district curriculum guidelines and students needs by providing multiple opportunities across the literacy block for reading, writing, speaking and listening. Teachers intentionally plan instruction aligned with a high level of rigor by using Webb’s Depth of Knowledge/Marzano’s Taxonomy and adjust instruction through the use of talk, task, text and student needs. While students are practicing, teachers observe, take notes and confer with students in individual or small groups to probe for understanding and provide targeted, actionable, feedback. Teachers will learn different ways to scaffold students so that all students |

can access grade level, complex text. during the core. They will develop an understanding of the shifts of instruction and additional PD, and utilize various strategies including close reading, strategy instruction, thinking maps, and text annotation to assist scholars in their thinking.

4. Teachers collaborate to select and implement rigorous tasks aligned with each standard, including Mathematics Formative Assessment System (MFAS) and Rich Mathematical Tasks from the Curriculum

Guides. Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning and adjust learning based on anticipatory practice on the spot.

5. Teachers implement daily Number Routines (Number Talks, High Yield Number Routines, Maintenance Routines, etc.) at the start of the math block to increase number sense and flexibility.

Person Responsible Annette Mavres (mavresa@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

A

| Part V: Budget | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|--|---|-----------------|-----|---------------------|
| 1 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap | | | | \$10,500.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$4,500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Social Emotional character books, Book studies on Energy and Hard Hat</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 330-Travel | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$6,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: AVID CRT training</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A | Areas of Focus: English Language Arts /Reading Goal | | | | \$164,912.34 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 5000 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$79,244.93 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Title 1 hourly</i> | | | |
| | 6300 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$23,224.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Professional Development and planning after school</i> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|--------------|--|---|-----------------|-----|---------------------|
| | 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$61,607.35 |
| | | | <i>Notes: MTSS Coach collection and review of data connected to the RTI process .</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$836.06 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Training for hourly teachers in reading interventions</i> | | | |
| 3 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Math Goal | | | | \$10,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$10,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Mathematical resources for hands on problem solving</i> | | | |
| 4 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Science Goal | | | | \$7,336.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$4,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Hand on materials for classroom science experiments.</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 140-Substitute Teachers | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$3,336.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Substitutes for TDE days</i> | | | |
| 5 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Conditions for Learning | | | | \$224,833.84 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | UniSIG | | \$28,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: ANet Professional Development</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | UniSIG | | \$17,600.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: ANet Standards Boot Camp</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 330-Travel | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | UniSIG | | \$4,400.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: ANet Boot Camp Teacher Registrations</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 369-Technology-Related Rentals | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | UniSIG | | \$6,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: MyAnet platformsite licenses</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | UniSIG | | \$13,500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Cambio Group Professional Development</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | UniSIG | | \$25,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Center for Transformational Teacher training (CT3)</i> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|--------------|---|--|-----------------|------|--------------------|
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | UniSIG | | \$15,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: UnBound's Standards Institute Professional Development</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | UniSIG | | \$15,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: New Leaders (Inspiring Transformational Leaders) Program</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | UniSIG | | \$9,599.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Harvard School of Education Data Wise</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | UniSIG | | \$26,963.84 |
| | | | <i>Notes: University of South Florida, St. Petersburg Professional Development</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | UniSIG | | \$6,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: American Reading Company Professional Development</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | UniSIG | 0.73 | \$46,067.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Intervention Teacher (Reading Recovery)</i> | | | |
| | 6300 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | UniSIG | | \$11,704.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: UniSIG Grant Coordinator</i> | | | |
| 6 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Attendance | | | | \$3,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$3,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Attendance tokens and incentives</i> | | | |
| 7 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement | | | | \$19,913.30 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$9,073.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: For family engagement nights in math, science and ELA.</i> | | | |
| | 6300 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$2,322.40 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Connect for Success computers for home</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 649-Technology-Related Noncapitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$8,517.90 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Connect for Success computer refresh</i> | | | |
| 8 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools | | | | \$2,000.00 |

| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 | |
|--|--------------|--|---|-----------------|-----|---------------------|--------------------|
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$2,000.00 | |
| <i>Notes: Mileage club tokens</i> | | | | | | | |
| 9 | III.A | Areas of Focus: ESSA - Students With Disabilities | | | | | \$5,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 | |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$5,000.00 | |
| <i>Notes: Jan Richardson Running Record Assessment kits, Literacy Footprint kits</i> | | | | | | | |
| 10 | III.A | Areas of Focus: ESSA- African American | | | | | \$2,867.32 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 | |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$2,867.32 | |
| <i>Notes: Jan Richardson Running Record Assessment kits, Literacy Footprint kits</i> | | | | | | | |
| 11 | III.A | Areas of Focus: ESSA- White | | | | | \$4,350.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 | |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$4,350.00 | |
| <i>Notes: Jan Richardson Running Record Assessment kits, Literacy Footprint kits</i> | | | | | | | |
| 12 | III.A | Areas of Focus: ESSA- Free and Reduced Lunch | | | | | \$25,224.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 | |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$2,000.00 | |
| <i>Notes: Jan Richardson Running Record Assessment kits, Literacy Footprint kits</i> | | | | | | | |
| | 6300 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 2141 - Lealman Avenue Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$23,224.00 | |
| <i>Notes: Professional development planning will be utilized over all goals in the SIP</i> | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$489,182.96 | |