

Orange County Public Schools

Killarney 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

Killarney Elementary

2401 WELLINGTON BLVD, Winter Park, FL 32789

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

Demographics

Principal: Mark Wiekowski

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2020

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)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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
Wieckowski, Mark	Principal	Mark Wieckowski will serve as the instructional leader at Killarney. Dr. Wieckowski will assist, support, and observe teachers with their data-driven decisions making skills to ensure that all students are meeting or exceeding academic and social/emotional expectations.
Rowe, Carlton	Teacher, Adult	Carlton Rowe (carlton.rowe@ocps.net) will serve as the school's Science and Behavior Resource Teacher. Mr. Rowe will support teachers by being a social/emotional learning resource and science coaching utilizing data to support instructional strategies.
Camp, Michelle	Guidance Counselor	The Guidance Counselor, Michelle Camp (michelle.camp@ocps.net) will be responsible for the social emotional wellness of the learners. Through the use of small group instruction and classroom support to teachers Ms. Camp will provide a developmental, systematic comprehensive program addressing the academic, and interpersonal/social needs of all students.
Wysong, Donna	Instructional Coach	Donna Wysong (donna.wysong@ocps.net) will serve as the Instructional Coach for the school. Ms. Wysong will also support teachers with enhancing instructional strategies using data to meet the needs of each learner.
Cannon, Dawn	Instructional Coach	Dawn Cannon (dawn.cannon@ocps.net) will serve as the school's Curriculum Resource Teacher and Staffing Specialist. Ms. Cannon will also support teachers with enhancing instructional strategies using data to meet the needs of each learner. Additionally, Ms. Cannon provides compliance support for teachers who service our ESE population.
Goulbourne, Shellise	Other	Shellise Goulbourne (shellise.goulbourne @ocps.net) will serve as the school's Reading Resource Teacher, MTSS Coach, and Interventionist. Ms. Goulbourne will meet with teachers to discuss student progress monitoring in Tiers II & III and provide instructional strategies to support struggling students.
Gutch, Brandi	Instructional Technology	Brandi Gutch (brandi.gutch@ocps.net) will serve as the school's Medial Specialist and Digital Coach. Ms. Gutch will support teachers with enhancing instructional strategies using the digital curriculum.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/9/2020, Mark Wiekowski

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.*

5

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

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: A (62%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	17	69	72	70	83	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	365
Attendance below 90 percent	1	13	16	13	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	8	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/8/2020

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	14	13	27	15	6	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	8	2	7	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	13	8	10	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	25	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	2	6	3	17	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	2	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	14	13	27	15	6	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	8	2	7	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	13	8	10	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	25	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	2	6	3	17	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	2	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	52%	57%	57%	59%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	58%	58%	60%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	52%	53%	58%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	59%	63%	63%	63%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	69%	61%	62%	76%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	48%	51%	56%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	63%	56%	53%	66%	55%	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	49%	55%	-6%	58%	-9%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	57%	-12%	58%	-13%
	2018	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
	2018	56%	55%	1%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	44%	62%	-18%	62%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	38%	61%	-23%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	63%	-5%	64%	-6%
	2018	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
05	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%
	2018	66%	59%	7%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	54%	2%	53%	3%
	2018	59%	53%	6%	55%	4%
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	29	57	67	38	57		50				
ELL	58	60		67	60		80				
BLK	48	59	50	48	66	65	53				
HSP	55	59		63	69		74				
WHT	51	79		71	71		69				
FRL	50	64	68	61	71	62	67				

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	25	45	46	46	71	54					
ELL	38	60		75	73						
BLK	56	60	60	56	76	61	61				
HSP	47	59		60	75						
WHT	66	59		74	73		78				
FRL	58	62	68	61	75	58	68				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	508
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	67
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	56
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	67
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	68
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	63
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 FSA data shows that 29% of our students with disabilities scored as proficient in ELA. There were multiple ESE teachers working with various students from the same grade level providing support without consistency among grade levels.

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

There was a 15% decline in ELA proficiency among our white students. During that year, the school focus was placed on increasing the ELL student proficiency which lead to a 20% increase from the prior year.

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

The school's overall ELA proficiency had a the greatest gap when compared to the state average, 57% (state) vs 52% (school), out of the various data components. During that school year, there was not a dedicated ELA resource teacher to help support teachers with instructional strategies.

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 would be the area of proficiency in ELA among our ELLs. During that year, the focus of the school was increasing the proficiency levels of this subgroup through professional development and target student support.

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

The area of most concern when examining the Early Warning System data is the attendance of students less than 90% data. This issue is across all grade levels.

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

1. Increasing the proficiency level of the students with disabilities in ELA.
2. Improving the proficiency of white students in ELA when compared to the previous years.
3. Decreasing the number of students who attend school less than 90% of the time.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on previous data, Killarney will need to increase Math proficiency. Math Proficiency for 2018-19 was at 59%. It is a critical need due to the fact that FSA has a heavier focus on proficiency than in past years.

Measureable Outcome: Killarney ES will increase Math proficiency achievement levels for 3rd - 5th for 59% to 64%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Killarney ES will be implementing Orange County Public Schools Minority Achievement Office's Acceleration Program as part of our after school tutoring program for struggling students where they are front-loaded key vocabulary and concepts for upcoming standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The strategies were chosen to support our students who fall into the yellow band of the i-Ready diagnostic. These students are close to grade-level but have gaps. The Acceleration Strategy has a proven record of data for moving these specific students to grade-level in a short amount of time.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be identified as being one grade level or less below their current grade level using the Beginning of the Year i-Ready Math diagnostic.

Person Responsible Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

2. Identified teachers will be trained on the Acceleration Program provided by Orange County Public Schools Minority Achievement Office representatives.

Person Responsible Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

3. On Tuesday and Thursday afternoon, students will enter a tutoring class led by a trained Acceleration Program teachers.

Person Responsible Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

4. Student will receive monthly growth monitoring on i-Ready for Math to track progress.

Person Responsible Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

5. Student groups will be fluid based on the monthly progress monitoring allowing more students to be targeted for the program.

Person Responsible Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on previous data, Killarney will need to increase ELA proficiency. ELA Proficiency for 2018-19 was at 52%. It is a critical need due to the fact that FSA has a heavier focus on proficiency than in past years.

Measureable Outcome: Killarney ES will increase ELA proficiency achievement levels for 3rd - 5th for 52% to 57%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Killarney ES will be implementing Orange County Public Schools Minority Achievement Office's Acceleration Program during our intervention times for struggling students where they are front-loaded key vocabulary and concepts for upcoming standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The strategies were chosen to support our students who fall into the yellow band of the i-Ready diagnostic. These students are close to grade-level but have gaps. The Acceleration Strategy has a proven record of data for moving these specific students to grade-level in a short amount of time.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be identified as being one grade level or less below their current grade level using the Beginning of the Year i-Ready ELA diagnostic.

Person Responsible Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

2. Identified teachers will be trained on the Acceleration Program provided by Orange County Public Schools Minority Achievement Office representatives.

Person Responsible Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

3. A daily rotation schedule will be created for these students during Fundamental Basic Skills, FBS, (grade-level intervention time) that feeds into the trained Acceleration Program teachers.

Person Responsible Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

4. Student will receive monthly growth monitoring on i-Ready. for ELA to track progress.

Person Responsible Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

5. Student groups will be fluid based on the monthly progress monitoring allowing more students to be targeted for the program.

Person Responsible Mark Wieckowski (mark.wieckowski@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Creating a more culturally responsive school culture is a school-wide improvement priority that will lead to decreases in discipline issues and attendance issues, especially among our economically disadvantaged students. Killarney ES serves a diverse community with a large amount of economically disadvantaged students. To better serve the families of these students, Killarney ES will engage our student population and community in several initiatives to increase awareness and support for our economically disadvantaged families. Killarney ES continues to employ a full-time bilingual Parent Engagement Liaison who coordinates community outreach events. Killarney operates a food pantry where families are given food every Friday for use over the weekend. Killarney ES actively recruits School Advisory Committee members from all subgroups served by our school.

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year.

The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.

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

Part V: Budget						
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0311 - Killarney Elementary			\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0311 - Killarney Elementary			\$0.00
Total:						\$0.00