

Leon County Schools

Frank Hartsfield Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 26 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 27 |

Frank Hartsfield Elementary School

1414 CHOWKEEBIN NENE, Tallahassee, FL 32301

<https://www.leonschools.net/hartsfield>

Demographics

Principal: Rhonda Blackwell Flanagan

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 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) | |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: D (35%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Jeff Sewell |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | NOT IN DA |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

Members of the Hartsfield School community are committed to becoming self-directed, life-long learners in a nurturing environment, which fosters connections, relationships, safety, high expectations, responsibility and respect for others.

Provide the school's vision statement

Hartsfield Elementary is a diverse School Family that embraces change. We are committed to providing a rigorous and equitable educational experience. It is our responsibility to produce students who are agents for their learning and are safe to grow academically, socially, and emotionally. To this end, we seek to facilitate an inquiry-based instructional delivery model that encourages collaboration and problem-solving. We promote international mindedness by developing the ability to connect with others in the interest of acting with compassion and serving the global community.

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 |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Blackwell-Flanagan, Rhonda | Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making and high-yield instructional strategies. These are discussed routinely in common planning meetings and monthly professional development workshops. The workshops are designed in collaboration with district-level experts in the field and team leaders to ensure that the needs of our students are addressed. • Recruit and retain highly qualified teachers and staff. • Ensure the school-based team is implementing the curriculum and the mission of the school is supported and endorsed. • Oversee and ensure the implementation of the MTSS process through intervention support and documentation, adequate professional develop to support MTSS, and communication with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. • Oversee and ensure the implementation of the new Conscience Discipline Plan is done with fidelity. • Manage and allocate resources in order to support and enhance the school's mission and vision. • Ensure that laws and policies are followed in the best interest of the students • Implement the district's performance evaluation procedure • Build capacity for teacher leadership and initiative • Communicate with all stakeholders in a positive manner. |
| Thompson, Lisa | Assistant Principal | <p>Assist Principal with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making and high-yield instructional strategies. These are discussed routinely in common planning meetings and monthly professional development workshops. The workshops are designed in collaboration with district-level experts in the field and team leaders to ensure that the needs of our students are addressed. • Recruit and retain highly qualified teachers and staff. • Ensure the school-based team is implementing the curriculum and the mission of the school is supported and endorsed. • Oversee and ensure the implementation of the MTSS process through intervention support and documentation, adequate professional develop to support MTSS, and communication with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. • Oversee and ensure the implementation of the new Conscience Discipline Plan is done with fidelity. • Manage and allocate resources in order to support and enhance the school's mission and vision. • Ensure that laws and policies are followed in the best interest of the students • Implement the district's performance evaluation procedure • Build capacity for teacher leadership and initiative • Communicate with all stakeholders in a positive manner. |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| Mathis, Gloria | Teacher, PreK | <p>Disseminates information from school administration, problem-solving school issues, and present grade level specific concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides information about core instruction. • Actively participates in student data collection. • Collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and support. |
| Clark, Tyler | Instructional Coach | <p>Directly participates in and facilitates student data collection and provides analysis of student data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborates with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies and assists with design and delivery of professional development relative to implementation of effective reading, math and science strategies. • Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers and intervention para-professionals • Supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions. |
| Lynch, Tara | Instructional Coach | <p>Ms. Lynch is an Instructional Coach and Guidance Counselor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directly participates in and facilitates student data collection and provides analysis of student data. • Collaborates with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies and assists with design and delivery of professional development relative to implementation of effective reading, math and science strategies. • Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers and intervention para-professionals • Supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions. • Schedules and facilitates MTSS meetings. Acts as support personnel and a liaison for parents and LCS team members. • Conducts evaluations/screenings such as ESOL/ELL, vision, hearing, cognitive measures, etc. • Coordinates the weekend food assistance programs for families, Red Ribbon Week activities, and abuse/mental health services for students. • Manages Section 504 requests and existing plans. |
| Reynolds, Erica | Teacher, K-12 | <p>Disseminates information from school administration, problem-solving school issues, and present grade level specific concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides information about core instruction. • Actively participates in student data collection. • Collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and support. |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Saar, Joanne | Teacher, K-12 | <p>Disseminates information from school administration, problem-solving school issues, and present grade level specific concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides information about core instruction. • Actively participates in student data collection. • Collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and support. |
| Perkins, Sophia | Teacher, K-12 | <p>Disseminates information from school administration, problem-solving school issues, and present grade level specific concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides information about core instruction. • Actively participates in student data collection. • Collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and support. |
| Betsey, Letashia | Teacher, K-12 | <p>Disseminates information from school administration, problem-solving school issues, and present grade level specific concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides information about core instruction. • Actively participates in student data collection. • Collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and support. |
| Peltier, Mary Jo | Instructional Media | <p>Disseminates information from school administration, problem-solving school issues, and present grade level specific concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides information about core instruction. • Actively participates in student data collection. • Collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and support. <p>Oversee the Media Center. Works with students on AR, STEM (3D printing and STEM activities, runs data class with all grade levels, Team Lead.</p> |
| Mustapha, Bomani | Dean | |
| Rushton, Raven | Teacher, K-12 | <p>Disseminates information from school administration, problem-solving school issues, and present grade level specific concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides information about core instruction. • Actively participates in student data collection. • Collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and support. |
| Pratt, Annalise | Teacher, K-12 | <p>Disseminates information from school administration, problem-solving school issues, and present grade level specific concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides information about core instruction. • Actively participates in student data collection. • Collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and support. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/29/2020, Rhonda Blackwell Flanagan

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.*

0

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 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) | Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: D (35%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Jeff Sewell |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Year | |
| Support Tier | NOT IN DA |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

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 | 83 | 63 | 68 | 64 | 57 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 394 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 21 | 11 | 12 | 19 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| One or more suspensions | 7 | 4 | 9 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| 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 ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 3 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |

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 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/29/2020

Prior Year - 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 19 | 11 | 22 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 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 | 12 | 14 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 19 | 11 | 22 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 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 | 12 | 14 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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 | 33% | 57% | 57% | 39% | 57% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 44% | 54% | 58% | 39% | 53% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 55% | 47% | 53% | 35% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 48% | 64% | 63% | 45% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 60% | 63% | 62% | 48% | 55% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 58% | 45% | 51% | 19% | 40% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 34% | 52% | 53% | 40% | 52% | 55% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (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.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 34% | 61% | -27% | 58% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 33% | 61% | -28% | 57% | -24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 31% | 57% | -26% | 58% | -27% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 58% | -13% | 56% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -14% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 32% | 56% | -24% | 56% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 34% | 57% | -23% | 55% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -13% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 51% | 63% | -12% | 62% | -11% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 42% | 64% | -22% | 62% | -20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 50% | 66% | -16% | 64% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 41% | 62% | -21% | 62% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 49% | 61% | -12% | 60% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 44% | 58% | -14% | 61% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 36% | 54% | -18% | 53% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 56% | -17% | 55% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| 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 | 17 | 40 | | 17 | 57 | | 8 | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 46 | 58 | 45 | 61 | 60 | 29 | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 39 | 52 | 44 | 62 | 57 | 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 | 21 | 42 | 43 | 26 | 50 | 27 | 27 | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 38 | 34 | 42 | 47 | 19 | 38 | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | 50 | | 79 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 31 | 36 | 37 | 35 | 44 | 20 | 35 | | | | |

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) | TS&I |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 332 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 28 |
| 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 | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 47 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 75 |
| 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 | 44 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic which resulted in the closing of schools in March 2020, the 2020 FSA was cancelled. As a result of this, we are comparing end of the year FSA results for 2019 to the winter Progress Monitoring data that was given five months prior to the 2020 FSA.

Based on the 2019-2020 winter i-Ready Reading diagnostic, ELA proficiency for 3rd-5th grade is the lowest performing data component at 34%. Factors contributing to this low percentage include significant phonic and fluency deficits in our rising 3rd grade students. Knowledge of vocabulary is an area which heavily impacted reading comprehension and ability to think critically about text.

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

Based on the 2019-2020 winter i-Ready Reading diagnostic, ELA proficiency for 3rd-5th grade decreased from 39% to 34%. Factors contributing to this low percentage include data collection taking place in December of 2019, as well as significant phonic and fluency deficits in our rising 3rd grade students. Knowledge of vocabulary, is an area which heavily impacted reading comprehension and ability to think critically about text.

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

Based on the 2019-2020 winter i-Ready Math diagnostic, Math proficiency for 3rd - 5th grade had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state average for Math proficiency was 62%. Hartsfield students scored at 36% proficient. Factors contributing to this low percentage include data collection taking place in December of 2019. Therefore, instruction had not yet taken place for a significant number of Math standards.

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

Based on the 2019-2020 winter i-Ready Math diagnostic, Math proficiency for 3rd - 5th grade showed the most improvement increasing from 19% to 36%. The actions our school took in this area were as follows: We increased classroom support personnel to decrease small group size; established biweekly Collaborative Interdisciplinary Planning; the implementation of the Acaletics curriculum; utilizing a dedicated Math/Science Instructional Coach; and the implementation of Reflex: Math Fact Fluency program.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our biggest area of concern from the EWS data is students with attendance less than 90%. We also have a large number of students that are tardy.

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

1. Increasing our ELA Proficiency
2. Increasing our Math & Science Proficiency
3. Maintaining and/or improving learning gains for all students, including our bottom 25% in ELA.
4. Maintaining and/or improving learning gains for all students, including our bottom 25% in math.
5. Improve our learnings for our ESSA subgroup, students with disabilities, in both reading and math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Overall ELA Learning Gains: 43% of our matched 4th and 5th grade students made learning gains on the 2018-2019 ELA FSA, which is a 4% increase from the 2017-2018 ELA FSA. As of January 2020, 46% of our 4th and 5th students made learning gains in ELA on the January 2020 winter benchmarks on STAR and the December 2019 benchmarks on i-Ready Progress Monitoring.

Measurable Outcome: The goal for the 2020-2021 school year is that 60% of our matched 4th grade students who were retained in 3rd grade and current 5th grade students in the lowest 25th percentile will make a learning gain on the 2021 ELA FSA or show evidence of growth on the 2020-21 STAR Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rhonda Blackwell-Flanagan (flanaganr@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Bi-weekly Collaborative interdisciplinary Planning
- Use of Formative and Summative Assessments
- Multi-sensory interventions in small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The utilization of these evidence-based strategies correlates directly to the targets of our school improvement goals. These strategies were intentionally chosen after an in-depth analysis of our school's performance and the identification of areas for growth. These strategies have been shown to have a positive impact on student growth when carried out with fidelity. The following action steps outline in more detail our planned implementation of the chosen strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

- We will continue to departmentalize our 5th grade students and hold a school-wide intervention block at the beginning of the school day. During this block, under the direction of Administrators and oversight of the Instructional Coaches, all available personnel will be trained and will assist with instruction in the school-wide intervention block.
- Instructional Coaches will collaborate weekly during the Data Drive-ins with all grade level teams to analyze progress monitoring data, plan instruction, share current research-based best practices and resources to maximize student achievement.
- Instructional Coaches will model and observe classroom instruction, as well as provide feedback in order to facilitate a systemic shift in the school's instructional capacity, increasing the teacher collective efficacy and thereby positively impacting student growth.
- Wonders formative and summative assessments, AR, AimsWeb, STAR, and i-Ready data will be used to help drive instructional decisions. In addition, the Instructional Coaches, will provide monthly analyses of classroom and school data to help target areas of improvement and conduct on going data chats with teachers. This process will be the platform for data driven instruction and designing interventions for students to ultimately help the school reach its' academic goals.
- We will utilize teacher-selected and para-directed i-Ready Tools for Instruction as a targeted intervention and enrichment program. We will also utilize supplemental intensive intervention programs (Lexonic, Reading Mastery, Read Naturally, Corrective Reading, Early Interventions in Reading, etc.) for students classified as having a Substantial Reading Deficiency, or students scoring below the 25th percentile on progress monitoring measures.
- As a major intervention to help build reading fluency and capacity in our early learners, we will implement a high frequency word card routine and Lexonic Leap in Kindergarten through

3rd grade to ensure our students are reading at, or close to, grade level when they reach an FSA-tested grade.

Person Responsible Rhonda Blackwell-Flanagan (flanaganr@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Bottom 25% ELA Learning Gains: 57% of our matched 4th and 5th grade students in the lowest 25th percentile made learning gains on the 2018-2019 ELA FSA, which is a 22% increase in learning gains from the 2017-2018 ELA FSA. As of January 2020, 50% of our 4th and 5th students in the lowest 25th percentile made learning gains in ELA on the January 2020 winter benchmarks on STAR and the December 2019 benchmarks on i-Ready Progress Monitoring. |
| Measureable Outcome: | The goal for the 2020-2021 school year is that 50% of our matched 4th grade students who were retained in 3rd grade and current 5th grade students will make learning gains on the 2021 ELA FSA or show evidence of growth on the 2020-21 STAR Assessments. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Rhonda Blackwell-Flanagan (flanaganr@leonschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bi-weekly Collaborative interdisciplinary Planning • Use of Formative and Summative Assessments • Multi-sensory interventions in small groups |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | The utilization of these evidence-based strategies correlates directly to the targets of our school improvement goals. These strategies were intentionally chosen after an in-depth analysis of our school's performance and the identification of areas for growth. These strategies have been shown to have a positive impact on student growth when carried out with fidelity. The following action steps outline in more detail our planned implementation of the chosen strategies. |

Action Steps to Implement

- We will continue to departmentalize our 5th grade students and hold a school-wide intervention block at the beginning of the school day. During this block, under the direction of Administrators and oversight of the Instructional Coaches, all available personnel will be trained and will assist with instruction in the school-wide intervention block.
- Instructional Coaches will collaborate weekly during the Data Drive-ins with all grade level teams to analyze progress monitoring data, plan instruction, share current research-based best practices and resources to maximize student achievement.
- Instructional Coaches will model and observe classroom instruction, as well as provide feedback in order to facilitate a systemic shift in the school's instructional capacity, increasing the teacher collective efficacy and thereby positively impacting student growth.
- Wonders formative and summative assessments, AR, AimsWeb, STAR, and i-Ready data will be used to help drive instructional decisions. In addition, the Instructional Coaches, will provide monthly analyses of classroom and school data to help target areas of improvement and conduct on going data chats with teachers. This process will be the platform for data driven instruction and designing interventions for students to ultimately help the school reach its' academic goals.
- We will utilize teacher-selected and para-directed i-Ready Tools for Instruction as a targeted intervention and enrichment program. We will also utilize supplemental intensive intervention programs (Lexonic, Reading Mastery, Read Naturally, Corrective Reading, Early Interventions in Reading, etc.) for students classified as having a Substantial Reading Deficiency, or students scoring below the 25th percentile on progress monitoring measures.
- As a major intervention to help build reading fluency and capacity in our early learners, we

will implement a high frequency word card routine and Lexonic Leap in Kindergarten through 3rd grade to ensure our students are reading at, or close to, grade level when they reach an FSA-tested grade

Person Responsible Rhonda Blackwell-Flanagan (flanaganr@leonschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Bottom 25% Math Learning Gains: 59% of our matched 4th and 5th grade students in the lowest 25th percentile made learning gains on the 2018-2019 Math FSA, which is a 40% increase in learnings gains from the 2017-2018 Math FSA. 56% of our lowest 25th percentile as of March 2020 were projected to make a learning gain on the 2019-20 Math FSA based on the January 2020 winter benchmarks on STAR and the December 2019 benchmarks on i-Ready Progress Monitoring.

Measureable Outcome: The goal for the 2020-2021 school year is that 60% of our matched 4th grade students who were retained in 3rd grade and current 5th grade students in the lowest 25th percentile will make a learning gain on the 2021 Math FSA or show evidence of growth on the i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rhonda Blackwell-Flanagan (flanaganr@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Bi-weekly Collaborative interdisciplinary Planning
- Use of Formative and Summative Assessments
- Multi-sensory interventions in small groups
- Spiraling curriculum implementation through i-Ready.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The utilization of these evidence-based strategies correlates directly to the targets of our school improvement goals. These strategies were intentionally chosen after an in-depth analysis of our school's performance and the identification of areas for growth. These strategies have been shown to have a positive impact on student growth when carried out with fidelity. The following action steps outline in more detail our planned implementation of the chosen strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

- Our Instructional Coaches will continue to work with teachers to implement data driven instruction and interventions in Math. Additionally, Go Math formative and summative assessments and i-Ready data will be used to help drive decisions.
- The Instructional Coaches will work with teachers to target the lowest 25th percentile students in Math and work with these students to increase fluency and problem-solving skills.
- Instructional Coaches will collaborate weekly with all grade level teams to plan instruction and share current research-based best practices and resources to maximize student achievement. I
- Instructional Coaches will model and observe classroom instruction and provide feedback in order to facilitate a systemic shift in the school's instructional capacity, increasing the teacher collective efficacy and thereby positively impacting student growth.
- Formative and Summative Assessments reports, and RTI meetings data will be used to help drive instructional decisions.
- I-Ready Math Programs will be used in Kindergarten through 5th classrooms to help math fluency and increase exposure to math concepts for struggling students.

Person Responsible Rhonda Blackwell-Flanagan (flanaganr@leonschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Overall Math Learning Gains: 61% of our matched 4th and 5th grade students made learning gains on the 2018-2019 Math FSA, which is a 13% increase from the 2017-2018 Math FSA. 61% of our students were projected to make a learning gain on the 2019-20 Math FSA based on the January 2020 winter benchmarks from STAR and the December 2019 benchmarks from i-Ready Progress Monitoring. |
| Measurable Outcome: | The goal for the 2020-2021 school year is that 62% of our matched 4th grade students who were retained in 3rd grade and current 5th grade students will make learning gains on the 2021 Math FSA or show evidence of growth on the i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Rhonda Blackwell-Flanagan (flanaganr@leonschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bi-weekly Collaborative interdisciplinary Planning • Use of Formative and Summative Assessments • Multi-sensory interventions in small groups • Spiraling curriculum implementation through i-Ready. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | The utilization of these evidence-based strategies correlates directly to the targets of our school improvement goals. These strategies were intentionally chosen after an in-depth analysis of our school's performance and the identification of areas for growth. These strategies have been shown to have a positive impact on student growth when carried out with fidelity. The following action steps outline in more detail our planned implementation of the chosen strategies. |

Action Steps to Implement

- Our Instructional Coaches will continue to work with teachers to implement data driven instruction and interventions in Math. Additionally, Go Math formative and summative assessments and i-Ready data will be used to help drive decisions.
- The Instructional Coaches will work with teachers to target the lowest 25th percentile students in Math and work with these students to increase fluency and problem-solving skills.
- Instructional Coaches will collaborate weekly with all grade level teams to plan instruction and share current research-based best practices and resources to maximize student achievement. I
- Instructional Coaches will model and observe classroom instruction and provide feedback in order to facilitate a systemic shift in the school's instructional capacity, increasing the teacher collective efficacy and thereby positively impacting student growth.
- Formative and Summative Assessments reports, and RTI meetings data will be used to help drive instructional decisions.
- I-Ready Math Programs will be used in Kindergarten through 5th classrooms to help math fluency and increase exposure to math concepts for struggling students.

Person Responsible Rhonda Blackwell-Flanagan (flanaganr@leonschools.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with Disabilities ELA and Math Learning Gains:
 • 17% of our matched 4th and 5th grade SWD students were proficient on the 2018-2019 ELA which was a 4% decrease from the 2017-2018 ELA FSA.
 • 17% of our matched 4th and 5th grade SWD students were proficient on the 2018-2019 Math FSA which was a 9% decrease from the 2017-2018 Math FSA.
 • 40% made learning gains on the 2018-2019 ELA FSA and 57% made learning gains on the 2018-2019 Math FSA.
 • Our overall goal for our ESSA subgroup-Students with Disabilities is 42% proficiency; however, for the 2020-2021 school year, we will target learning gains in both ELA and Math.

Measureable Outcome: Students with Disabilities: Our target goal for the 2020-2021 school year for our matched 4th grade students who were retained in 3rd grade and current 5th grade students is 60% for overall learning gains in both ELA and Math or to show similar growth on the 2020-2021 i-Ready Diagnostic and STAR Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rhonda Blackwell-Flanagan (flanaganr@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: • Bi-weekly Collaborative interdisciplinary Planning • Use of Formative and Summative Assessments • Multi-sensory interventions in small groups

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The utilization of these evidence-based strategies correlates directly to the targets of our school improvement goals. These strategies were intentionally chosen after an in-depth analysis of our school’s performance and the identification of areas for growth. These strategies have been shown to have a positive impact on student growth when carried out with fidelity. The following action steps outline in more detail our planned implementation of the chosen strategies

Action Steps to Implement

- We will continue to departmentalize our 5th grade students and hold a school-wide intervention block every morning at the beginning of the school day. During this block, under the direction of administration and oversight of the Instructional Coaches, all available personnel will be trained and will assist with instruction in the School-wide Intervention Block.
- The ESE Resource teacher along with a highly qualified para-professional will continue to either push-in or pull-out to conduct small group intervention for our Student’s with Disabilities. The Resource teacher will work closely and collaborate with the student’s classroom teacher designing interventions for students to ultimately help these students reach their academic goals.
- Instructional Coaches will collaborate weekly with all grade level teams to plan instruction and share current research-based best practices and resources to maximize student achievement.
- Instructional Coaches will model and observe classroom instruction and provide feedback in order to facilitate a systemic shift in the school’s instructional capacity, increasing the teacher collective efficacy and thereby positively impacting student growth.
- Wonders Formative and Summative Assessments, AR, AimsWeb, STAR, and iReady data will

be used to help drive instructional decisions. In addition, the Instructional Coaches, will provide monthly analyses of classroom and school data to help target areas of improvement and conduct on going data chats with teachers. This process will be the platform for data driven instruction and designing interventions for students and ultimately helping the school to reach its academic goal.

- We will utilize teacher-selected and para-directed i-Ready Tools for Instruction as a targeted intervention and enrichment system. We will also utilize supplemental intensive intervention programs (Reading Mastery, Read Naturally, Corrective Reading, Early Interventions in Reading, etc.) for SWD students.
- As a major intervention to help build reading fluency and capacity in our early learners, we will implement a high frequency word card routine and Lexonic Leap in Kindergarten through 3rd grade to ensure our students are reading at, or close to, grade level when they reach an FSA-tested grade.
- At the beginning of the school year, as an intervention to help build reading fluency and capacity in our Student's with Disabilities, we will use Lexonic Advance or Lexonic Leap depending on placement test to improve their phonemic awareness. These students will receive bi-weekly AIMS testing to monitor their progress and help drive instructional decisions.
- Our Instructional Coaches will continue to work with teachers to implement data driven instruction and interventions in Math. Additionally, Go Math formative and summative assessments and i-Ready data will be used to help drive decisions.
- The Instructional Coaches will work with teachers to target the lowest 25th percentile students in Math and work with these students to increase fluency and problem-solving skills.
- Ready Math Programs will be used in Kindergarten through 5th classrooms to help math fluency and increase exposure to math concepts for struggling students.
- We will pull SWD student into small groups for STAR and i-Ready.
- The resource teachers and para, Mills, Domingos, and Kesler will conduct the AIMS testing for our Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible Rhonda Blackwell-Flanagan (flanaganr@leonschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to Primary Years Programme

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | The I.B. Primary Years Programme is a transdisciplinary inquiry-based program that our school has committed to adopting to improve and sustain our academic and social-emotional learning objectives (in conjunction with Conscious Discipline). As a school in the Candidacy phase, we are beginning to write our collaborative programme of inquiry – starting with one trial unit at each grade level (K-5). |
| Measureable Outcome: | Hartsfield Faculty and Staff will work collaboratively to write and implement a minimum of one Primary Years Programme trial transdisciplinary unit at each grade level (K-5) by the conclusion of the 2020-2021 school year. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Rhonda Blackwell-Flanagan (flanaganr@leonschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. We will utilize the International Baccalaureate Organization’s suggested methodology for collaborative planning practices to develop a trial unit at each grade level for our school-wide Programme of Inquiry. We will implement trial units and use the IBO unit planning reflection tool to adjust and revise the trial units as necessary. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. The strategy and method selected is required by the IBO. |

Action Steps to Implement

- Continue Primary Years Programme (PYP) professional development for 22 Faculty members through an online I.B. workshop running from August 12th – September 2nd.
- Continue professional development on inquiry and conceptual-based teaching, learning, and assessment.
- Collaborative curriculum writing sessions across grade level and content area teachers.
- I.B. Coordinator will conduct observations and provide feedback to teachers on inquiry and conceptual-based teaching, learning, and assessment.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

One of our highest priorities identified in the Needs Assessment/Analysis relates to proficiency in ELA, Math and Science. Due to COVID-19, our students have been out of school since March 2020; therefore, we will not set proficiency goals at this time. In September and October 2020, through diagnostic testing, we will establish our current academic baseline for ELA, Math and Science and focus our efforts on ensuring our students make the necessary learning gains which will facilitate a path to proficiency.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Our school organization is multi-faceted and provides a pathway for engagement and voice at each level. Our internal organization includes the administration consisting of principal, assistant principal, dean, and academic coaches; team leaders that represent each grade level; and a SITE team that includes representatives across grade level teams, support staff, and building maintenance. Additionally, we have a Student Council that is representative of the student voice across the intermediate grades. Externally, we have the School Advisory Council which serves in an advisory capacity in the process of improving school programs. They have the opportunity to provide input on the planning, review, and improvement of Title I programs and how funds for Parent and Family Engagement will be allocated; and finally the PTO which provides support to school programs and functions in the best interest of students and teachers.

Each arm of the organization contributes to improving the overall attitude and climate for teaching and learning and together the work that is done sets the tone for a culture that is engaging, connected, responsive, and respectful as each unit provides a pathway for engagement of stakeholders.

Since we are a Title I school, at the beginning of the school year, an Annual Title I Meeting will be held in conjunction with Open House. This meeting will take place on September 17, 2020. Parents will receive information on the purpose, requirements and the benefits of being a Title I School. Feedback will be provided through the use of parent feedback forms as well as the spring Title I surveys. The data collected is a tool used in assessing the needs relative to the

culture and climate of the school and is shared with stakeholders and included in the school improvement planning process.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

| Part V: Budget | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|--|----------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Primary Years Programme | \$0.00 |
| | | | Total: \$0.00 |