

Sarasota County Schools

Fruitville Elementary School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	13
Budget to Support Goals	15

Fruitville Elementary School

601 HONORE AVE, Sarasota, FL 34232

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/fruitville

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	59%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	A	A*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota 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.

Fruitville Elementary wants all students to achieve at their academic potential, to love learning, to feel valued as individuals, and to develop healthy self-esteem and good citizenship in a safe environment. We also want parents and community members to feel welcomed and be an integral part of the learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fruitville will prepare students to achieve the highest learning standards by engaging and supporting an enthusiastic, empathetic, high quality staff that tries to meet the needs of each individual child. We involve parents as partners in their children's educations, and work collaboratively with the community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
French, Steven	Principal
Spinale, Melissa	School Counselor
Burger, Stephanie	Attendance/Social Work
Hannon, Jamie	Assistant Principal
Portnowitz, Gina	Psychologist
Rogers-Hehr, Christina	School Counselor
Kramer, Kate	Teacher, K-12
Ard, Danielle	Teacher, ESE
Neumann, Debbie	Other
Calderin, Vivian	Other

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Steven French - Principal- Administrative support

Jamie Hannon- Assistant Principal

Melissa Spianale/Christina Rogers-Hehr - Guidance Counselor- 504/CARE facilitator

Kate Kramer- ESE Liaison

Debbie Neumann- Behavior Specialist

Stephanie Burger- School Social Worker,

Gina Portnowitz- School Psychologist

Danielle Ard - ESE Liaison

Vivian Calderin - ESOL Liaison

The role of the Admin/MTSS team at Fruitville Elementary is to analyze relevant school data for the purpose

of problem analysis, intervention development, and goal setting in order to develop and implement the SIP plan. Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) guides our discussions. Each member of the team also is a grade level facilitator for the MTSS process and represents that team at weekly student SWST meetings.

The Admin team is responsible for reviewing progress towards indicators on the BPIE (Best Practices in Inclusive Education) at a monthly meeting.

Indicators to target include:

#6 "School data reflect that all SWDs, ages 3-5, receive special education and related services in the regular early childhood (Pre-K) and kindergarten classes with peers without disabilities.

#18 "Special, electives and career technical education (CTE) teachers have regularly scheduled opportunities to consult with special education teachers and related service providers to implement strategies that support the learning of all SWDs in their classes."

#30 "Learning opportunities and resources are provided to families of SWDs as a result of needs assessments and student data."

#31 "When communicating with families of SWDs, all personnel consider family members as a resource and obtain their input in planning and problem solving."

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	23	11	13	11	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	1	5	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

Date this data was collected

Tuesday 10/2/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	12	8	8	8	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	4	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	12	8	8	8	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	4	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The lowest quartile in ELA and math were the areas with the most room for improvement. Over the past several years we have seen stagnant or declining scores in the lowest quartile performance in both subjects in ELA and Math.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Math proficiency scores with our lowest quartile population declined from 67% to 51%.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

ELA achievement at Fruitville showed a positive gap when compared to the state. Our students performed at 76% while the state ELA average was 56%. The only area Fruitville performed below the state average was Math Learning Gains. Fruitville scored 57% while the state average was 59%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Fruitville showed an increase in all areas of ELA. ELA scores have been fluctuating in proficiency, lowest quartile and learning gains over the last few year. After implementing many strategies (listed below) we believe this will be the start of an upward trend in all ELA score components going forward.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

PATCH work tutoring program: Teachers will work before or after school with students identified as being in the lowest quartile in ELA in grades 2, 3 and 4. Skills covered will be based on individual student needs.

Teacher Looping: 3rd grade teachers from the 16-17 school year looped up to 4th grade with their students for the 17-18 school year. this allowed teachers to know their students' strengths and weaknesses from day one. Positive teacher-student relationships were already established.

Full inclusion model K-5th: ESE resources students received services in a general education classroom with push-in or co-teaching models.

Quarterly Team Planning: Teachers working together to gain a greater understanding of grade level standards. Teacher will plan instruction/assessments which align with LAFS and review grade level student performance data to drive upcoming instruction.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	76%	66%	56%	75%	65%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	57%	55%	57%	54%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	46%	48%	56%	49%	46%
Math Achievement	80%	72%	62%	77%	70%	58%
Math Learning Gains	57%	63%	59%	68%	66%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	51%	47%	52%	50%	46%
Science Achievement	73%	66%	55%	61%	64%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	23 (12)	11 (8)	13 (8)	11 (8)	12 (10)	12 (11)	82 (57)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	0 (0)	1 (2)	2 (2)	2 (2)	0 (5)	5 (12)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (6)	9 (9)	17 (13)	34 (28)

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	2018	72%	68%	4%	57%	15%
	2017	68%	71%	-3%	58%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	74%	67%	7%	56%	18%
	2017	77%	69%	8%	56%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2018	75%	66%	9%	55%	20%
	2017	64%	66%	-2%	53%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	82%	72%	10%	62%	20%
	2017	81%	71%	10%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	87%	71%	16%	62%	25%
	2017	83%	73%	10%	64%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2018	69%	72%	-3%	61%	8%
	2017	69%	70%	-1%	57%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	73%	67%	6%	55%	18%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	46	59	58	58	52	43	21				
ELL	52	68	67	72	63	50	45				
BLK	59			47							
HSP	64	64	55	74	53	48	60				
MUL	77	50		77	70						
WHT	86	69	53	87	60	58	84				
FRL	69	66	59	75	58	48	68				
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	41	35	39	61	55	56	37				
ELL	54	53	56	74	61	59	57				
BLK	24	33	40	38	57		58				
HSP	64	57	52	77	73	72	63				
MUL	73			82							
WHT	85	64	65	89	74	59	82				
FRL	64	54	51	75	69	70	63				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	English Language Arts (ELA)
Rationale	While we saw all scores for ELA increase this year, we noticed our current lowest quartile ELA performance is stagnant. We are trying to push this group of students to reach achievement and show a learning gain.
Intended Outcome	<p>1. By the year 2019, there will be a minimum of 4%-point increase for all students when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain on FSA ELA.</p> <p>2. By the year 2019, there will be a minimum of a 4%-point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile on FSA ELA.</p> <p>3. By the year 2019, there will be a minimum of a 2%-point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across 3,4 & 5) on FSA ELA.</p>
Point Person	Jamie Hannon (jamie.hannon@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Identify lowest quartile students who currently do not receive any additional instructional supports. -creation of academic interventionist/instructional coach to support teachers with data analysis/instructional strategies and facilitate LLI groups with students -Complete grade level running records 3-5 to determine intervention groups -Implement Leveled Literacy Interventions (LLI) with select students in lowest quartile -Quarterly Team Planning: Teachers working together to gain a greater understanding of grade level standards. Teacher will plan instruction/assessments which align with LAFS and review grade level student performance data to drive upcoming instruction. -CPT days- collaborative planning time with the administration to complete data analysis and identify student performance gaps and/or areas for acceleration. Teacher will calculate points required to show a learning gain and group students with similar needs. Review grade level common assessments to gain insight on standards previously taught. -Grade 3-5 ELA professional development opportunities provided by school district to increase instructional strategies
Person Responsible	Jamie Hannon (jamie.hannon@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Student progress in LLI groups will be monitored monthly at admin team meetings. Students that are still exhibiting minimal to no progress will be brought to school wide support team. - Review grade level performance data on common assessments and iReady. -Instructional observations in classrooms to monitor instructional strategies and interventions

Person Responsible Jamie Hannon (jamie.hannon@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Activity #2	
Title	Math
Rationale	Math performance scores over the past three school years have fluctuated from year to year. Lowest quartile performance and math learning gains are areas of concern. Our lowest quartile in math dropped from a 67% to 51% proficient. Our learning gains in math also fell below the state average (59%) to 57%.
Intended Outcome	<p>1. By the year 2019, there will be a minimum of 4%-point increase for all students when 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain on FSA Math.</p> <p>2. By the year 2019, there will be a minimum of a 4%-point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile on FSA Math.</p> <p>3. By the year 2019, there will be a minimum of a 2%-point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across 3,4 & 5) on FSA Math.</p>
Point Person	Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Reivew summative data from the 17-18 school year to identify student performance deficits. -administer common grade level assessments based on standards in math to identify students that still need skill remediation or re-teaching (paper or iReady standards mastery) -after reteaching/remediation identify students that are still showing difficulty and bring to School wide support team -provided before/after school PATCH work tutoring as necessary based upon individual skill deficits -creation of academic interventionist/instructional coach to support teachers with data analysis/instructional strategies and facilitate intervention groups with students -Quarterly Team Planning: Teachers working together to gain a greater understanding of grade level standards. Teacher will plan instruction/assessments which align with MAFS and review grade level student performance data to drive upcoming instruction. -CPT days- collaborative planning time with the administration to complete data analysis and identify student performance gaps and/or areas for acceleration. Teacher will calculate points required to show a learning gain and group students with similar needs. Review grade level common assessments to gain insight on standards previously taught. -After school math tutoring provided by grade level math experts tailored to individual student needs
Person Responsible	Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -CPT data discussions with grade level teams based upon iReady standards mastery -review of targeted intervention data weekly at SWST -quarterly data discussion with summative assessment results

Person Responsible Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Activity #3

Title Science

Rationale Science proficiency stayed exactly the same from 16-17 to 17-18 school year. The need for science standards and vocabulary to explicitly taught is crucial to future growth.

Intended Outcome 1. By the year 2019, there will be a minimum of 2%-point increase for all students where 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across levels 3,4 & 5) on FCAT 2.0 Science.

Point Person Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Action Step

Description

- Provide time for collaboration among science teachers to share best practices. Interactive science lab fostering inquiry skills ,vocabulary and scientific method.
- Schedule 5th grade students to receive an additional 15 minutes every time they attend science as a specials class (additional 380 minutes over the course of the school year)
- 12 of science boot camp to review science standards from grades 3-4

Person Responsible Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description

- Participate in and monitor CPTs with teacher to analyze student performance results on curriculum based assessments and county bench mark assessments to identify gaps in student learning
- Institutional observations of science blocks to ensure coverage of science standards

Person Responsible Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Fruitville is lucky to have great parental involvement. Those who are registered serve as volunteers in the classroom to support student learning. The school also utilizes the Student Advisory Council, PTO, and Fruitville First MATES. group to support the mission and vision of the school. Throughout the school year, the school will present both academic and social-emotional topics to keep families abreast of new initiatives and programs that would benefit their children. A monthly newsletter which speaks to academics, operations, and school community related news items is presented on the school website.

The school has a Facebook account with weekly updates. Connect Ed and REMIND are used to inform parents of upcoming events. This year we will conduct parenting workshops which cover a variety of topics. These topics include: Parent portal, ESOL, AT-Risk information night, FSA assessments, math instruction, and children's safety. Parent University is a program offered as part of our summer learning academy. Parent University is a series of parents nights concentrating on various areas that affect student learning. Topics will includes best practices strategies and resources, analysis of schoolwide and individual data, behavioral support, attendance etc.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The school counselor is used to provide support to students in multiple ways. Counseling is provided in small group settings and one-on-one sessions. CAARS is provided to students as indicated on their I.E.P.S. Whole group lessons are also provided throughout the school year as appropriate. We have added a mental health counselor as a resource to students and families on campus and as a school-community connection. Outside agencies also provide support to our teachers and students through whole group lessons. Fruitville also has a wonderful mentoring program that many of the staff participates in. Participating staff members are paired with a child and meet weekly in various settings to mentor selected students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Every year we hold an annual K roundup that offers parents best practices, tips, and insight as to ways they can aide in effective transitions from Pre-K to K. In addition, our school implements a screening program over the summer to identify student readiness and allows teachers to instruct at appropriate instructional levels from day 1 of school. Fruitville host a summer learning experience, Pirate Prep Academy, open to all incoming K students. Lessons focus on K readiness and early literacy skills. Select 1st grade students who have not yet mastered grade-level ELA standards are also invited to attend. Their lessons focus on literacy activities designed to get students on grade level before starting 1st grade in August.

To support our 5th graders transitioning to middles school a field trip to their future middle school is scheduled in their final quarter at Fruitville. 5th graders are able to tour campus and even hear about course offerings.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The School Wide Support Team (SWST) team facilitates the MTSS, Multi-Tiered System of Supports, process and collaborates once a week to discuss existing data and information, identify students' needs, problem solve, and to make recommendations for future activities in regard to student's academic performance, behavior, attendance, and overall school-wide adjustment. The SWST designates a member of the team to work with each grade level one time per week to discuss individual students and progress monitoring data. Based on the data review, instructional strategies are identified and a timeline of implantation will be constructed

The Title I funds that we receive will be used to provide subs for our teachers to attend professional development activities and collaborate on best instructional practices and improve overall student performance.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Fruitville hosts an annual career day every February. Student in grades 3-5 rotate through a variety of classroom presenters from all different careers. They are given the opportunity to ask questions. Students in grades K-2 participate in a vehicle parade. This parade includes services vehicles from a variety of industries (medical, police, utilities, ice cream trucks, postal service, etc.) Our goal is to spark our students with interest and thoughtful consideration of the many different career opportunities that are available to them. By participating in amazing presentations and an engaging parade we feel it will help guide them into these beginning thoughts.

Part V: Budget

Total:

\$18,100.00