

Orange County Public Schools

Zellwood Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Zellwood Elementary

3551 WASHINGTON ST, Zellwood, FL 32798

<https://zellwoodes.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Frank Mattucci

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2020

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)	<p>Black/African American Students</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged Students</p> <p>English Language Learners</p> <p>Hispanic Students</p> <p>Students With Disabilities</p> <p>White Students</p>
School Grades History	<p>2018-19: C (49%)</p> <p>2017-18: C (48%)</p> <p>2016-17: C (46%)</p> <p>2015-16: D (36%)</p>
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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 Orange 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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Mattucci, Frank	Principal	Oversees the MTSS process, participates in MTSS meetings, teacher observations (formal and informal) and teacher evaluations.
Hunter, Carissa	Instructional Coach	Coordinates and provides professional development, coordinates curriculum materials and assessments, provides support to teachers in the teacher induction program, coordinates state and district assessments.
Cordero, Evelisse	Guidance Counselor	Oversees the CHAMPS program, coordinates mental health counseling provides counseling to individuals and small groups, participates in Behavior Team meetings and Thread Assessment team meetings, and is the school's homeless liaison.
Jadonath, Harrischandra	Instructional Coach	Provides coaching, modeling, resources, and support to teachers in math and science.
Jacovino, Barbara	Instructional Coach	Oversees and manages media center, provides library resources for students and teachers, provides coaching support for teachers, provides reading resources for interventions and enrichment, provides professional development.
Hildago, Ena	Other	Coordinates Dual Language Program and assessments for ELL students, monitors ELL students and services, participates in MTSS meetings for ELL students.
Turnage, Deborah	Other	Coordinates the ESE eligibility process when a student does not respond to interventions, coordinates and monitors ESE services, coordinates 504 Plan eligibility process and monitors plans.
Ward, Cecelia	Assistant Principal	Oversees the MTSS process, participates in MTSS meetings, teacher observations (formal and informal) and teacher evaluations.
Green, Sherron	Other	Develop and promote positive behavior, monitor and provide intervention for students' disciplinary concerns

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/10/2020, Frank Mattucci

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

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 English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	27	97	94	91	107	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	3	16	19	13	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	8	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/6/2020

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	92	92	95	105	108	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	586
Attendance below 90 percent	20	27	14	23	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	6	7	4	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	39	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

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	5	2	2	13	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	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	92	92	95	105	108	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	586
Attendance below 90 percent	20	27	14	23	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	6	7	4	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	39	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

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	5	2	2	13	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	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	51%	57%	57%	47%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	58%	58%	48%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	52%	53%	38%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	52%	63%	63%	53%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	42%	61%	62%	56%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	20%	48%	51%	38%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	56%	53%	45%	50%	51%

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	46%	55%	-9%	58%	-12%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	62%	-8%	62%	-8%
	2018	60%	61%	-1%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	63%	-13%	64%	-14%
	2018	56%	62%	-6%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
	2018	50%	59%	-9%	61%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
	2018	50%	53%	-3%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	52	52	23	33	17	15				
ELL	40	57	65	46	38	14	48				
BLK	32	47	50	32	40	17	38				
HSP	47	60	67	51	40	17	51				
WHT	67	57	60	65	45		78				
FRL	41	55	65	45	40	19	51				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	13	40	40	36	50	64					
ELL	38	37	35	51	46	37	36				
BLK	28	47		51	50	40	47				
HSP	43	33	26	55	46	34	48				
WHT	63	60		66	60		67				
FRL	42	38	41	55	51	39	46				

2017 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	5	29	27	21	39	42	14				
ELL	28	38	33	46	55	40	32				
BLK	39	39		41	52	36	22				
HSP	41	48	40	51	57	37	44				
WHT	61	51	50	62	58		61				
FRL	47	48	38	53	56	38	45				

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
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	62
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	48
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.

The lowest 25th percentile in Math performed the lowest at 20%, which is a three year trend.

Math proficiency levels decreased by six percentage points. Some contributing factors may have been a lack of teacher training and familiarity with the math small group structure. Also, there was a lack of content knowledge related to the standards.

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

The largest decline was present in the math lowest 25th percentile, from 39% to 20%, a 19 percent decline. Contributing factors may have been a lack of correlating data from i-Ready to the standardized data results. Confusion about instructional grouping may have also been a factor.

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.

Mathematics proficiency was eleven percentage points below the state average. This data reflects a decline that is not associated with a downward trend for the area.

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

The ELA Lowest 25% percentile group grew by 21 percent from 42% in 2018 to 63% in 2019. This growth can be attributed to school-wide focus on writing and explicit writing instruction and support for the lowest 25 percentile group. Resource teacher provided intensive ELA small-group instruction for lowest 25 percentile students.

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

A potential area of concern is the course failures in mathematics by our lowest 25% as well as the number of level 1 statewide assessment performance results.

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

1. Increase the proficiency levels in Mathematics
2. Learning gains in Mathematics
3. Lowest 25% in Mathematics
4. Maintain the growth in ELA
5. Maintain the growth in Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The 2018-2019 FSA data proficiency performance in Mathematics showed a decline from the previous year, as well as a decline in the achievement in the lowest 25% for mathematics. This is a critical area for students and needs to be improved for the mathematical competence of our students.

Measureable Outcome: By increasing the rigor of standards-based instruction, proficiency in Mathematics will increase from 52% to 55%. Our lowest 25% will increase from 20% to 40%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Harrischandra Jadonath (harrischandra.jadonath@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The leadership team will monitor the implementation of the lessons in the classroom by using common walk-through tool. The leadership team will calibrate scoring to ensure consistent high-expectations. This calibration will take place in leadership meetings (bi-weekly). Teachers will be provided with actionable feedback from the classroom walk-through that focus on the implementation of standards-based instruction, student engagement, use of manipulatives and small group interventions for mathematics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was selected to provide actionable feedback based on a common tool to teachers in order to improve the mathematics instruction presented to students. This will provide a means for coaching teachers and assuring best practice instruction that will increase math fluency, critical thinking skills and close reading of content-based problems.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Training will be provided to the teachers on best practices for instruction and collaborative planning.
2. the administration and instructional coaches will conduct calibrated walk-throughs to determine trends and create a method to best address areas of concerns.
3. Feedback will be provided to teachers on mathematics instruction either written, face to face, or digitally by administration and instructional coaches.
4. Direct coaching and support for teachers will be provided by the instructional coaches.
5. The administration and instructional coaches will monitor and reflect with teachers.

Person Responsible Cecelia Ward (cecelia.ward@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25 Percentile: The 2018-2019 FSA data proficiency performance in Mathematics showed a decline from the previous year, as well as decline in the achievement of lowest 25% in mathematics. The 20192020 school year will be the first where all students have a digital device. The integration of digital learning will be critical for students success in all content areas and tier-level.

Measureable Outcome: We will see a proficiency increase in mathematics from 52% to 55% and increase learning gains for the lowest 25 percentile by a minimum of three percentage points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated instruction through the use of the digital tools will lead to more effective small groups and individualized learning. The individualized learning will directly impact the student-specific needs and increase student engagement. This strategy will be monitored by using the various reporting functions of the digital learning programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Use of the digital tools for learning will link the 21st century skills with the district initiatives for learning. This strategy will increase student engagement and connection with the content as well as more readily accessible data reporting and direct feedback on performance tasks and activities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Train teachers and students on the best practice use of the digital tools for learning.
2. Monitor the student engagement and provide actionable feedback.
3. Conduct student conferences to set goals for digital learning outcomes
4. Provide parent training and support for the monitoring of their child's digital learning
5. Evaluate the effectiveness of student learning through academic notebooks and other monitoring tools
6. Monitor the use of the ST Math computer program
7. Monitor the use of the McCarthy Math program
8. Provide additional personnel to assist with students in a small group

Person Responsible Frank Mattucci (franklin.mattucci@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The Zellwood Elementary School is always encouraging children to succeed not only in the academic area but also in the social and emotional areas of their everyday lives. Implementing Social Emotional Learning will help the students acquire the skills needed to be successful. We will be teaching the students the CASEL'S 5 Competencies.

Measurable Outcome: In order to measure the effectiveness of the Social Emotional Learning instruction, we will do a pre and post assessment on social and emotional skills. By implementing the SEL strategies using Sanford Harmony, we will see growth of at least 50% on the post test.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Evelisse Cordero (evelisse.cordero@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will start using Sanford Harmony SEL curriculum during Health class and the "Meet Ups" (morning meetings) prior to starting instructions for the day.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Sanford Harmony is a researched based curriculum that provides the lessons that will help us build a culture of Social Emotional learning. The resources are in English and Spanish. They also provide a family component where parents will be able to continue this learning experience.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school's leadership team will monitor the action steps in the Areas of Focus as well as the ELA and Math Level 1's.

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.

We have and will continue to provide ongoing teacher trainings in social emotional learning. The trainings will include the CASEL 5 Core Components of Social Emotional Learning as well as exploring means to facilitate the teaching and promotion of empathy as a school community. The format for promoting SEL will be focused on promoting mindfulness, challenge thinking and fostering persistence and determination for teachers and students. Also, the teachers will use the Sanford Harmony program with the students. The program focuses on teaching critical social competencies necessary for success in academics and life such as resiliency, self-management, and responsible decision-making skills.

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: Math				\$10,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0461 - Zellwood Elementary	Title, I Part A	620.0	\$10,500.00
			<i>Notes: McCarthy Math will be utilized to provide teachers with guidance with teaching the Math standards. Also, ST Math is a visual math program that builds a deep conceptual understanding of math through rigorous learning and creative problem solving.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				\$15,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	0461 - Zellwood Elementary	Title, I Part A	620.0	\$15,000.00
			<i>Notes: Staff will be used to support students in the bottom 25% in the area of Math.</i>			
			0461 - Zellwood Elementary			\$0.00
			0461 - Zellwood Elementary			\$0.00

			0461 - Zellwood Elementary			\$0.00
			0461 - Zellwood Elementary			\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
Total:						\$25,500.00