

Pinellas County Schools

John M. Sexton Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

John M. Sexton Elementary School

1997 54TH AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33714

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

Demographics

Principal: Tony Pleshe

Start Date for this Principal: 6/18/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: D (33%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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 Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

John M. Sexton Elementary School

1997 54TH AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33714

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	D

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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.

To inspire and engage students to achieve their highest potential leading to college, career and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

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
Pleshe, Tony	Principal	The roles and responsibilities of the leadership team include acting as instructional coaches, data managers and professional development support systems. Our members meet weekly to address, monitor and problem solve the current status of School Improvement plan goals. In these meetings, we discuss next steps and ways to address areas of concern. We then work together to draft a plan and make adjustments as needed if we are not on track with our original plan.
Middleton, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	
	Instructional Coach	
Marinari, Karen	Attendance/Social Work	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/18/2018, Tony Pleshe

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

23

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: D (33%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	35	71	70	74	86	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	3	25	18	17	20	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Thursday 6/18/2020

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	59	74	66	87	73	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	1	11	6	12	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	15	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	1	0	2	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	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	59	74	66	87	73	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	1	11	6	12	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	15	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	1	0	2	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	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	42%	54%	57%	40%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	59%	58%	35%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	54%	53%	18%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	61%	63%	44%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	52%	61%	62%	39%	61%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	48%	51%	20%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	53%	53%	33%	53%	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	51%	56%	-5%	58%	-7%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	56%	-21%	58%	-23%
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
	2018	39%	50%	-11%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
	2018	43%	62%	-19%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	64%	-17%	64%	-17%
	2018	53%	62%	-9%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	44%	60%	-16%	60%	-16%
	2018	47%	61%	-14%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	37%	54%	-17%	53%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	45%	57%	-12%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	13	43	43	18	47	47					
ELL	32	53		32	47						
ASN	50	67		61	67						
BLK	29	40	46	35	42	43	17				
HSP	39	52	55	44	56	50	40				
MUL	53	45		47	36						
WHT	46	49	44	58	55	33	42				
FRL	37	45	45	46	49	36	29				
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	27	35	13	44	35	13				
ELL	11	46		21	47	50					
ASN	43	50		50	50						
BLK	27	27	21	32	56	67	26				
HSP	40	57	45	48	63	50	25				
MUL	38	36		44	45						
WHT	48	52	39	51	59	44	57				
FRL	36	43	36	41	54	53	38				
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	11	15	8	14	26	30					
ELL	17	11		22	28						
ASN	45			48	70		50				
BLK	20	17	21	24	32	25	8				
HSP	34	29		41	25		23				
MUL	28			37							
WHT	49	43	17	52	39	20	43				
FRL	33	28	16	38	34	19	29				

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	47
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	61
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
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	47

Hispanic Students	
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	45
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	47
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	42
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.

Comparing data from 2019 FSA data to 2020 Winter MAP data, ELA has trended lower. The last two years Sexton has put into place several high yields math strategies.

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

Science is the greatest area of concern along with the ESE subgroup.

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.

Science has the greatest gap when you compare it to the state average. Data used to analyze this is two years old due to state suspending FSA and SSA. Emphasis on ELA and Math overshadowed science.

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

Math has been trending up for the past two years. School-wide initiatives and incentive programs were developed.

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

ESE and Black/African-American subgroups

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

1. Decrease gap between subgroups
2. Increase over all scores in each category
3. Increase learning gains for all
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of performance is 43%, as evidenced in ELA FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because the depth of knowledge of standards and the varying use of high yield strategies.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of students scoring level 3 or higher will increase by from 43% to 53% as measured by the 2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Identifying similarities and differences Summarizing and note taking Reinforcing effort and providing recognition Homework and practice Nonlinguistic representations Cooperative learning Setting objectives and providing feedback Generate and testing hypothesis Questions, cues, and advance organizers</p> <p>In Classroom Instruction that Works: Research-based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement, Robert Marzano (2001) and his colleagues identify nine high-yield instructional strategies through a meta-analysis of over 100 independent studies. They determined that these nine strategies have the greatest positive affect on student achievement for all students, in all subject areas, at all grade levels.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

1. Content Professional Development working with Marzano's 9 High Yield Strategies
2. Designated PLC's that allow for teachers to collaboratively plan for differentiation. Use ELA Champion to bring back content and provide model classrooms. This will be done virtually or face to face. Follow up with an impact study.
3. Designated Monthly PLC to allow teachers to visit other classrooms with a purpose aligned to the 9 Strategies
4. Implement AVID school wide with PD monthly
5. Align individual teacher's Deliberate Practice with beyond the school day professional development that address deficiencies identified by classroom data

Person Responsible Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our current level of performance is 52%, as evidenced in the Math FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because lack of number sense.

Measurable Outcome:

The number of students scoring 3 or higher will increase by 10 percentage points as measured by the 2021 FSA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

8 Step Model Drawing
Read, rewrite, who/what, draw, chunk/adjust/question, compute and write.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In the book, 8-Step Model Drawing: Problem Solving Strategies, offers a way to bridge the gap between the concrete and abstract levels, reinforcing students' visualization and understanding of math concepts and processes through model drawing. With this approach, students move from abstract to solid foundation which to build skill. Students develop problem-solving skills and real number sense.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Content Professional Development - Math Teacher Leadership Institute.
2. Designated PLC's that allow for teachers to collaboratively plan
3. Designated Monthly PLC to allow teachers to visit other classrooms with a purpose aligned to math best practice.
4. Implement AVID school wide with PD monthly
5. Utilize district resource for training with iready and Dreambox.
6. Align individual teacher's Deliberate Practice with beyond the school day professional development that address deficiencies identified by classroom data

Person Responsible

Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our current level of performance is 35%, as evidenced on Science State Assessment. The problem/gap is occurring because the depth of knowledge of standards and the varying use of high yield strategies.

Measurable Outcome:

The number of students scoring level 3 or higher will increase by from 35% to 45% as measured by the 2020 Science State Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model (10% setting the purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) and include appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignment to the 1st – 5th grade standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

High-quality science instruction moves students from curiosity to interest to reasoning (Moulding, Bybee, and Paulson 2015). The progression of learning occurs with each science and engineering experience and is magnified by frequency and intentionality. Over time and through multiple and varied experiences, children develop skills in scientific discourse.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Content Professional Development working with 5E instructional model and 10-70-20 science model (Focus on 20% - who got it and who didn't)
2. Designated PLC's that allow for teachers to collaboratively plan for science (include vertical articulation)
3. Implement Science Camp in 4th and 5th Grade based on diagnostic test
4. Develop, implement and monitor a data driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th Grade Diagnostic Assessment.
5. Implement AVID school wide with PD monthly
6. Monitor use of science lab

Person Responsible

Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)

#4. Other specifically relating to Bridging the GAP

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Eliminate the gap between the proficiency rates in reading (ELA) and math on state and national assessments for black and non-black students. Current rate for our ELA is 41% while our Black rate is 37%.
Measurable Outcome:	Eliminate the gap between the proficiency rates in reading (ELA) and math on state and national assessments for black and non-black students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as oral language and storytelling, cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, morning meetings, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans in order to increase the percentage of proficient students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John M. Sexton is commitment to culturally relevant curriculum, materials, and training in support of rigorous, engaging instruction in all classrooms. Our work is based off Dr. Mary Conages' 6 M's.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Content Professional Development working with Equity and the 6 M's
2. Instructional Leadership provides feedback that is actionable and targeted on equity based strategies.
3. Designated Monthly PLC to allow teachers to visit other classrooms with a purpose aligned to observing culturally relevant instruction.
4. Implement AVID/CRT school wide with PD monthly
5. Align individual teacher's Deliberate Practice with professional development that address deficiencies identified by classroom data

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#5. Other specifically relating to School Climate/Conditions for Learning

<p>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</p>	<p>Our current level of performance in regards to school-wide behavior is 23 office referrals. Looking deeper at the data; Asian students 0%, Black students 26.1%, Hispanic students 8.7%, Multiracial students 13% and White students 52.2%.</p>
<p>Measurable Outcome:</p>	<p>The number of students receiving discipline referrals will decrease from 26 to 13, as measured by the end of the 2021 school year School Profiles Report.</p>
<p>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</p>	<p>[no one identified]</p>
<p>Evidence-based Strategy:</p>	<p>The use of PBIS framework to change the focus of negative consequences for breaking rules to positive rewards for following the rules.</p>
<p>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</p>	<p>PBIS is an approach for teaching appropriate behavior and developing a school's social culture. With PBIS, the focus on positive-reinforcement and increasing (scaffolding) levels of rewards and consequences</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Set clear social expectations
2. Acknowledge and reinforce positive behavior
3. Consistent consequences for problem behavior
4. Collection and review of behavior data to drive decision-making

Person Responsible Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As a result of equity-centered problem solving within the MTSS framework, our school will develop an equity goal to build relational capacity, empower student voice, and hold high expectations through professional development and equity-based problem solving.

Measurable Outcome: We will address the mindset shift of equitable practice, by participating in school wide equity-centered PD. We will schedule/calendar monthly based PD to strengthen cultural relevant practices with a lens on equity and restoration.
We will improve equity based problem solving by engaging in equity-centered SBLT, PLCs and CST. We will engage in deeper discussions on race and gender and their impacts on achievement within SBLT/PLC/CST data discussions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We will build leadership capacity to facilitate equity-centered problem solving within SBLT/PLCs/CST.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1-The SBLT will review FSA data from 18-19 and 2020 Winter Map data to identify the Black/ multiracial students not meeting proficiency. The MTSS Coach will monitor the names identified within each SBLT/ PLC/CST data discussion: weekly/bi-monthly.
- 2- The Leadership/Equity and RP teams will meet to develop a professional development plan and schedule of training for school staff. Other staff will be invited to provide input for preferred training or text readings during the August preschool training. Trainings & text readings will be delivered in virtually, in person or through the weekly updates by the Administration, Equity or RP team members.
- 3-Equity centered problem solving will occur with SBLT/PCS/CST to determine why a pre identified Black student is underachieving. Based on the results of the problem solving process, students will be identified for different interventions, tier 2/3 interventions, testing for ESE eligibility, site based mentors/academic coaching, or a change of teacher.
- 4-Students will have daily opportunities to voice their concerns within classroom circle meetings.

Person Responsible Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)

#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our current level of performance is 82.5% attendance rate, as evidenced by our record keeping data system, Focus. The problem/gap is occurring due to the number of family events that take place as reported in Focus. It should also be noted that students attendance history move with them when moving schools during the year.

Measurable Outcome:

The number of absences will decrease by 10 percentage points which will bring our attendance rate to 92.5% as measured by Focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Marinari (marinarik@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

PBIS is utilized to encourage attendance which includes arrival on time and early pick up.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Chronic absenteeism – defined as a student missing 15 or more days per school year – affects up to 14% of school populations. These students are at greater risk of not completing their academic career. Beginning in elementary school, students missing two days of class per month end up missing about 10% of the total school year. Each absence puts them further behind their peers, especially when it comes to literacy. By third grade, learning to read becomes reading to learn. Students who read at grade level by the end of third grade are three to four times more likely to graduate high school and pursue post-graduate education.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement PBIS- making school attendance a priority.
2. Child Study Team will monitor student absenteeism.
3. Social Worker will provide support to families that have high absenteeism.
4. Student recognition at Awards Assemblies
5. An administrator will make a call if a student shows a pattern of absenteeism in the first 6 weeks.

Person Responsible

Karen Marinari (marinarik@pcsb.org)

#8. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of parent engagement in school sponsored events is 35%, as measured by sign in sheets at each school activity. In addition, we will use a parent survey to collect base line information on family engagement with learning.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of families participating in school sponsored events will increase from 35% to 45% as measured by parent sign in sheets during the 2020 - 2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement school and family events in a systematic, integrated, sustained and meaningful approach that will engage parents and families, are linked to learning as well as celebrating family and school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John M. Sexton believes that effective family engagement is grounded in partnership of shared responsibility among families, community organizations and schools and that it occurs across multiple settings and contexts in which children can learn and families can connect.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop a community relations program that includes volunteers, businesses, parents and other agencies to increase the capacity of our school to engage with our community.
2. Actively encourage and facilitate family participation in school events by developing activities that engage students, parents and school personnel in joint activities that are tied to learning.
3. Increase awareness of education by providing academic tools to families in support of their students' achievement at home, helping parents build a culture of high expectations.
4. Provide multiple opportunities for families to be involved through a variety of activities at school and at home, and communicate with them regarding the various factors that promote students' academic success.
4. Create a welcoming school environment that respects and celebrates language and cultural diversity and display student work throughout the building and ensure families receive written communication in the home languages they speak, or provide translation services.
5. Regularly solicit parent feedback and input on school activities and events. Encourage parents with leadership capacity to be parent representatives on school leadership teams by making personal connections.

Person Responsible Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)

#9. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our current level of performance is Gold, as evidenced in Alliance for a Heathier Generation. We currently do not have a gap.

Measurable Outcome:

We expect our performance level to be Gold during the 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Velez (velezj@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Through our evidence-based Healthy Schools Program, John M. Sexton has adopted policies and practices that empower the entire school community to move more, eat better, and develop healthy habits.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Every child deserves a healthy future. John M. Sexton seeks to empower kids to develop lifelong healthy habits by ensuring the environment here provides and promotes good health.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Offer healthy breakfast and lunch to all students
2. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment
3. Offer 150 minutes of physical education weekly
4. Offer 20 minutes of recess daily
5. Provide professional development and other health related activities for the faculty and staff

Person Responsible

Jennifer Velez (velezj@pcsb.org)

#10. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of performance is 11%, as evidenced in ELA FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because ELL students need access to language rich environments.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of students scoring level 3 or higher will increase by from 11% to 45% as measured by the 2021 ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Setting high expectations for ELL students by creating opportunities for ELLs to participate in talent groups and have access to a full range of extracurricular activities before and after school even before they are fully proficient in English.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	For the nation as a whole, NAEP reveals that ELL students were far behind white students in their mathematics and reading skills.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Designated PLC's that allow for teachers to collaboratively plan with ELL Strategies in mind
2. Designated Monthly PLC to allow teachers to visit other classrooms with a purpose of observing ELL strategies
3. Implement AVID school wide with PD monthly
4. Provide ELL students access to the Talent Groups offered
5. Provide ELL students access to the After school Enrichment Programs offered

Person Responsible Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)

#11. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of performance is 30%, as evidenced in ELA FSA/ESSA. The problem/gap is occurring because the lack of inclusionary practices and high expectations.
Measurable Outcome:	The FFPI of 30% will increase by 28% to 58% as measured by the 2020 ELA FSA/ESSA data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusive education. One key teaching strategy is to break students into small groups. By using small groups, teaching can be tailored to the way each student learns best. ESE teachers will push in to classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The achievement gap between students with disabilities and students without disabilities has remained largely unchanged despite adaptive technologies and supposedly research-based methods.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Content Professional Development working with Marzano's 9 High Yield Strategies
2. Designated PLC's that allow for teachers to collaboratively plan
3. Designated Monthly PLC to allow teachers to visit other classrooms with a purpose aligned to the 9 Strategies
4. Implement AVID school wide with PD monthly
5. ESE Teachers push in to classrooms

Person Responsible Tony Pleshe (pleshet@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Professional Development and training calendars have been structured to assist teachers in gaining new knowledge to implement School Improvement Goals. Additionally, content coaches will work with grade levels in PLC's. Student incentives and contests will be developed to help improve work ethic and stamina.

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.

John M. Sexton Elementary will continue to build positive relationships by increasing our efforts to communicate with our families. We will do this by continued use of our monthly school newsletter, use of agendas, Class Dojo school wide/individual story, website and school messenger.

We will also provide events tied to build parent content area knowledge as well as fun activities for the family.

1. Title I Annual Meeting
2. Meet the Teacher
3. Math Night
4. Concerts & Art Exhibits
5. Family Valentine's Dance

Due to current condition from Covid-19, Sexton will develop virtual activities to include our students who are learning online. In addition we will provide family activities that support learning.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Bridging the GAP	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: School Climate/Conditions for Learning	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
9	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools	\$0.00
10	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00

11	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00