

Sarasota County Schools

Southside 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	8
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	11

Southside Elementary School

1901 WEBBER ST, Sarasota, FL 34239

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/southside

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	No	27%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

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.

To use data-driven instruction for progress monitoring, so that each student is learning, succeeding and reaching above and beyond their potential every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To learn, to dream, to laugh, to love every child every day - whatever it takes!

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Nzeza, Jennifer	Principal
Mattern, Christine	Teacher, K-12
West , Carol	Teacher, K-12
Miller, Michele	Teacher, K-12
Miller, Kent	Assistant Principal
Sobolewski, Danielle	Teacher, K-12
DeNegris, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12
Holman , Stacey	Teacher, K-12
Colgate, Laurel	Teacher, ESE
Stewart, Kristen	Teacher, K-12
Casanas, Katie	Teacher, K-12

Duties

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

Each Spring instructional staff members have the opportunity to express interest in serving on the School Leadership Team for their grade level or department area. The School Leadership Team has regularly scheduled meetings on Monday afternoons. During these meetings school wide instructional goals are reviewed. Members are given opportunity to make decisions regarding capital outlay needs, professional development offerings and instructional practices in the school.

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	11	10	7	6	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	5	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	14	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

Date this data was collected

Friday 10/5/2018

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	8	11	8	9	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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	1	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	8	11	8	9	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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	1	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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?

Our Math students in the lowest 25th percentile performed the lowest when looking at the school data and comparing it the previous year. This is not a trend.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Math Lowest 25th percentile students showed the greatest decline. As a school there was a 32% decline from 2017 data to the 2018 data.

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

Compared to the state average the data component with the biggest gap when compared to the state average was Math Lowest 25th percentile. For this data component Southside was 4 points lower than the state average. Southside was 43% compared to 47% for the state average.

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

Based on the data we did not see improvement in any area. However, our ELA achievement showed the least decline as it went from 88% to 85%. We believe our ELA score is directly related to the success of our 3rd grade achievement scores (which were at 94% for Level 3 and above).

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

Our 3rd grade team was a strong cohesive team that collaborated regularly. In addition, our before and after school FSA preparation sessions benefited these students.

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	85%	66%	56%	82%	65%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	57%	55%	62%	54%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	48%	56%	49%	46%
Math Achievement	83%	72%	62%	78%	70%	58%
Math Learning Gains	60%	63%	59%	76%	66%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	51%	47%	61%	50%	46%
Science Achievement	79%	66%	55%	77%	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	11 (8)	10 (11)	7 (8)	6 (9)	14 (5)	19 (4)	67 (45)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	9 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (4)	0 (7)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (24)	12 (8)	14 (12)	31 (44)

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	94%	68%	26%	57%	37%
	2017	88%	71%	17%	58%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	84%	67%	17%	56%	28%
	2017	87%	69%	18%	56%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2018	81%	66%	15%	55%	26%
	2017	87%	66%	21%	53%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	86%	72%	14%	62%	24%
	2017	87%	71%	16%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2018	83%	71%	12%	62%	21%
	2017	87%	73%	14%	64%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2018	81%	72%	9%	61%	20%
	2017	88%	70%	18%	57%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	79%	67%	12%	55%	24%
	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	45	27	15	45	27	15	35				
ELL	75			67							
HSP	72	54	38	76	56	53	67				
MUL	91	53		86	74						
WHT	87	69	51	85	60	41	81				
FRL	75	55	41	77	61	43	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	50	57	57	47	71	75	75				
ELL	75	70		81	80						
HSP	77	69	73	77	81	77	70				
MUL	96	87		93	87						
WHT	89	76	66	89	80	78	86				
FRL	83	65	60	80	71	57	78				

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 Math Lowest 25th Percentile

Rationale Area where data revealed the greatest decline and also the only area where the school was below the state average when analyzing the data.

Intended Outcome By the end of SY 18-19 47% of the lowest quartile students will be successful in making a learning gain as demonstrated on the FSA Mathematics Spring Assessment.

Point Person Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Action Step

Description All teachers will identify the lowest 25th percentile in their class and the progress of those students will be monitored throughout the year. Grade level teams will develop and discuss interventions to implement with the identified students.

Person Responsible Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Careful analysis of the lowest 25th percentile at each grade level through i-ready performance and achievement on grade level assessments. Grade level teams will share results and/or progress of the lowest 25th percentile with administration at data chats that occur three times within the school year.

Person Responsible Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Activity #2

Title ELA Lowest 25th Percentile

Rationale This area showed a significant drop (20%) in success of our lowest 25th percentile students.

Intended Outcome By the end of SY 18-19 52% of the lowest quartile students will be successful in making a learning gain as demonstrated on the FSA ELASpring Assessment.

Point Person Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Action Step

Description 1. Intensive FSA preparation for 3rd grade students.
2. More intensive reflection and use of i-Ready data to drive small group instruction.
3. Restructuring of the ESE program (model, schedule and staffing)

Person Responsible Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description 1. Track the progress of FSA prep participants.
2. Discussion during post observation conferences and data chats will be used for i-ready data.
3. Ongoing observations, data analysis, feedback from classroom teachers of push-in students

Person Responsible Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Activity #3	
Title	Science
Rationale	We see a need for growth in Science as we dropped 6% points in this area. We noticed that our ESE subgroup was the lowest performing group in Science as well.
Intended Outcome	By the end of SY 18-19, 81% of the students will demonstrate proficiency on the Spring Science Assessment. By the end of SY 18-19, 39% of our ESE subgroup will demonstrate proficiency on the Spring Science Assessment
Point Person	Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	Science curriculum during Specials will include a spiral of the 3rd-5th curriculum to review and reinforce the standards from each grade level. Blocking time in the master schedule for science instruction school wide. All grade levels will participate in the Science fair in varying degrees depending on the grade level. ESE subgroup will participate in a co-teaching model.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Classroom walk-throughs, administration review of lesson plans, and class presentations of science projects at various grade levels to administration.
Person Responsible	Kent Miller (kent.miller@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Activity #4	
Title	Social Studies
Rationale	It is important for all our students to be productive members of society through exposure to a curriculum that focuses on civility as well the appreciation of history.
Intended Outcome	Students will participate in the following initiatives: PBIS, Civility Squad, Kindness Campaign, Constitution Day, Veterans Day, and Hispanic and Black History Month, etc.
Point Person	Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	The social studies curriculum will be incorporated throughout the school day in the Social Studies block and/or the ELA block. The morning news show will used to highlight specific programs, initiatives, and school wide social studies activities. Schedule changes and direct instruction related to school-wide expectations will be utilized to increase understanding and use of civility curriculum.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	PBIS team will be involved in monitoring the data as it relates to school wide discipline and expectations. Administration will monitor lesson plans and the social studies instruction taking place in the classrooms.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Activity #5	
Title	Math ESE students
Rationale	We noticed a significant decline in the learning gains of our ESE students (25% from 2016-17 to 2017-18).
Intended Outcome	Improve the learning gains of all ESE students in two specific areas: 1. Students in the lowest 25% of learning gains; and 2. Hispanic students who are also ESE students.
Point Person	Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	1. Revamp our ESE teaching model. 2. Include ESE teachers in our Data Chats (held 3 times per year) - for the first time. 3. District and administrative support for use and data analysis of iReady. 4. Creating subgroups within iReady to closely analyze each subgroup's progress.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	1. A close examination of instruction through classroom walkthroughs and observations. 2. Participation in Data Chats. 3. Participation in the iReady trainings and follow-up with administration on iReady implementation and progress. 4. Reports will be analyzed weekly for time-on-task, activity, and success rate.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$6,000.00
---------------	-------------------