

Sarasota County Schools

# Fruitville Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# Fruitville Elementary School

601 HONORE AVE, Sarasota, FL 34232

[www.sarasotacountyschools.net/fruitville](http://www.sarasotacountyschools.net/fruitville)

## Demographics

**Principal: Steven French**

Start Date for this Principal: 1/6/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	61%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (64%) 2014-15: A (79%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# Fruitville Elementary School

601 HONORE AVE, Sarasota, FL 34232

[www.sarasotacountyschools.net/fruitville](http://www.sarasotacountyschools.net/fruitville)

## School Demographics

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

## School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
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.

#### Core Values

Diversity-Embracing the variety of our cultures while respecting each other and all working towards a common goal.

Belonging-Creating an environment where people from all walks of life including students, families and staff feel accepted, comfortable, safe and part of a family.

Collaborative-Working together to create an environment that respects and enhances our Fruitville community strengths while celebrating differences for success achievement for all.

Integrity-Committing to high morals, honesty and ethics even when no one is watching.

Growth mindset-Encouraging place to grow. We embrace challenges and persevere through obstacles to succeed.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

To foster productive ethical students working together through respect and integrity for the greater good of all.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
French, Steven	Principal	<p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <p>#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.</p> <p>#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.”</p> <p>#30 “Learning opportunities and resources are provided to families of SWDs as a result of needs assessments and student data.”</p> <p>#31 “When communicating with families of SWDs, all personnel consider family members as a resource and obtain their input in planning and problem solving.”</p>
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	
Costa, Kristen	Other	Behavior Specialist
Calderin, Vivian	Other	



**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	149	121	132	117	116	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	754
Attendance below 90 percent	8	9	12	6	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

**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	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

**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		5	4	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

62

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 9/6/2019

**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
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 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	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

**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
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 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	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

**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	73%	68%	57%	72%	68%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	62%	58%	60%	63%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	53%	53%	53%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	80%	73%	63%	81%	72%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	67%	62%	73%	68%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	53%	51%	67%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	65%	53%	73%	64%	51%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	149 (0)	121 (0)	132 (0)	117 (0)	116 (0)	119 (0)	754 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	8 (23)	9 (11)	12 (13)	6 (11)	9 (12)	7 (12)	51 (82)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	2 (0)	1 (1)	1 (2)	1 (2)	5 (0)	10 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (8)	7 (9)	10 (17)	23 (34)

**Grade Level Data**

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	70%	0%	58%	12%
	2018	72%	68%	4%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	67%	8%	58%	17%
	2018	74%	67%	7%	56%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	69%	68%	1%	56%	13%
	2018	75%	66%	9%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	73%	3%	62%	14%
	2018	82%	72%	10%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	72%	12%	64%	20%
	2018	87%	71%	16%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	74%	70%	4%	60%	14%
	2018	69%	72%	-3%	61%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	66%	65%	1%	53%	13%
	2018	73%	67%	6%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	44	48	32	58	54	44	32				
ELL	48	44	28	73	69	55	46				
BLK	48	50		46	42	27					
HSP	59	54	28	73	69	54	59				
MUL	91	90		95	90						
WHT	83	69	63	87	73	53	78				
FRL	65	62	40	74	63	48	68				
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				

## 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	63
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	505

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	92
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## 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.**

We see the lowest performance the proficiency performance of our lowest 25th percentile in ELA (43%) and math (50%). Over the past several years we have seen stagnant or declining scores in the lowest quartile performance in both subjects in ELA and Math. The majority of these students are identified as students with a disability or ESOL students. These students require direct specially designed instruction for all academics.

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

ELA proficiency scores with our lowest quartile population declined from 55% to 43% this 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.**

ELA achievement at Fruitville showed a positive gap when compared to the state. Our students performed at 73% while the state ELA average was 57%. In Math achievement, Fruitville performed at a 80% and the state average was 63%. The only area Fruitville performed below the state average was Math Lowest quartile. Fruitville scored 50% while the state average was 51%.

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

We showed the most improvement in Math learning gains we climbed from a 57% to a 70%. We provided strategic interventions for students needing to show large growth to indicate a gain. We had teachers pushing into different grade levels during their planning to support small group targeted instruction.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Attendance percentage below 90% is still an area of concern at all grade levels. Unfortunately, at the elementary level the majority of attendance concerns relate to parental involvement. We work closely with our truancy worker to intervene.

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

1. ELA lowest 25th percentile
2. Math lowest 25th percentile
3. ELA Learning Gain
4. ELA achievement
5. Science Achievement

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	English Language Arts (ELA)
<b>Rationale</b>	We saw all scores for ELA decrease this year. We noticed our current lowest quartile ELA performance was stagnant but declined by 12% this year. We are trying to push this group of students to reach achievement and show a learning gain.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>1. By the year 2020, 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 from 63% to 67%.</p> <p>2. By the year 2020, 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 from 43% to 47%.</p> <p>3. By the year 2020, 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 &amp; 5) on FSA ELA from 73% to 75%.</p> <p>4. By the year 2020, there will be a minimum of a 4%-point increase for students in the lowest quartile sub groups ELL (28% to 32%) , SWD ( 32% to 36%) and HSP (28% to 32%) demonstrating a learning gain on FSA ELA.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jamie Hannon (jamie.hannon@sarasotacountyschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Leveled-Literacy Intervention, Collaborative monthly planning, targeted literacy professional development
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	What Works Clearinghouse states that LLI is designed to help struggling readers meet grade-level achievement after short-term intervention. The intervention provides explicit instruction in phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, oral language skills, and writing
<b>Action Step</b>	

<b>Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Identify lowest quartile students who currently do not receive any additional supports.</li> <li>-creation of 2 academic interventionists positions to facilitate LLI &amp; instructional strategy groups</li> <li>-creation of instructional literacy coach to support teachers with data analysis, model instructional strategies whole and small groups, and facilitate literacy intervention design</li> <li>-Complete grade level running records K-3 to determine intervention groups</li> <li>-Implement Leveled Literacy Interventions (LLI) with select students in lowest quartile</li> <li>-Monthly Team Planning: Teachers working together to gain a greater understanding of grade level standards and review grade level student performance data to drive upcoming instruction.</li> <li>-CPT days- collaborative planning time with the administration to complete data analysis and identify student performance gaps and/or areas for acceleration.</li> </ul>
--------------------	---



Teacher will calculate points required to show a learning gain and group students with similar needs.

-Grade 2-5 ELA professional development opportunities provided by school district to increase instructional strategies

**Person  
Responsible**

Jamie Hannon (jamie.hannon@sarasotacountyschools.net)

---

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Math
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>Math performance scores over the past three school years have fluctuated from year to year. Lowest quartile performance continues to be an area of concern. Our learning gains in math, however, jumped from a 57% to a 70%. Our proficiency remained the exact same at 80%.</p>
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. By the year 2020, there will be a minimum of 2%-point increase for all students when 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain on FSA Math from 70% to 72%.</li> <li>2. By the year 2020, 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 from 50% to 54%.</li> <li>3. By the year 2020, 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 &amp; 5) on FSA Math from 80% to 82%.</li> <li>4. By the year 2020, there will be a minimum of a 4%-point increase for students in the lowest quartile sub group BLK (27% to 31%) demonstrating a learning gain on FSA Math.</li> </ol>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Review summative data from the 18-19 school year to identify student performance deficits.</li> <li>-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)</li> <li>-after reteaching/remediation identify students that are still showing difficulty and bring to SWST</li> <li>-provided before/after school PATCH work tutoring as necessary based upon individual skill deficits</li> <li>-creation of academic interventionist/instructional coach to support teachers with data analysis/instructional strategies and facilitate intervention groups with students</li> <li>-Monthly Team Planning: Teachers working together to gain a greater understanding of grade level standards. Plan instruction/ assessments which align with MAFS and review grade level data to drive upcoming instruction.</li> <li>-CPT days- 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.</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Monthly planning time, monitoring common assessments, whole-grade level data analysis leads to collective teacher efficacy (effect size 1.57). Individually targeted interventions delivered during the school day and during after school tutoring sessions lead to a positive response to intervention (effect size 1.07).
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CPT data discussions with grade level teams based upon iReady standards mastery</li> <li>2. identify lowest quartile and learning gain goals</li> </ol>

3. monthly data discussion with summative assessment results
4. Group students based on needs and intervene
5. review of targeted intervention data weekly at SWST

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

**#3**

**Title** Science

**Rationale** Science proficiency dropped from a 73% to 69% The need for science standards and vocabulary to explicitly taught is crucial to future growth.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** By the year 2020, there will be a minimum of 4%-point increase for all students where less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across levels 3,4 & 5) on FCAT 2.0 Science from 69% to 73%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome** Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy**

- 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
- STEM committee to set school-wide science calendar and with supporting activities

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** Monthly planning time to monitoring district science benchmark assessments and whole-grade level data analysis lead to collective teacher efficacy (effect size 1.57).

**Action Step**

**Description**

1. -Participate in and monitor CPTs with teacher to analyze student performance results on curriculum based assessments and county benchmark assessments to identify gaps in student learning
2. -Instructional observations of science blocks to ensure coverage of science standards
3. Purchase the lab kits connected to new science curriculum to provide students with hands-on learning opportunities
4. Creation of STEAM class on specials rotation (an extra 25 hours of science based instruction for the year)

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

<b>#4</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Social Emotional Learning
<b>Rationale</b>	As our population shifts at Frutiville, we see a need to create a sense of community where all students, staff and families feel welcome and safe to learn.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By the year 2020, we will see a positive trend in our students' social and emotional skills as measured by the number of students displaying early warning indicators from 12% to 10%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jamie Hannon (jamie.hannon@sarasotacountyschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Resorative strategies (circle process), PBS school, House System (Fruitville Fleet), Mentoring program, 2 Gen programs for parents, PIRATE nights
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Creating a community centered in our 5 core values will increase the following areas: Parent Involvement (.49 effect size), teacher-student relationships (.72 effect size), Student motivation (.48 effect size), and classroom behaviors (.68 effect size).
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Ensure all staff are trained in restorative circles</li> <li>2. Create schoolwide community culture (Fruitville Fleet)</li> <li>3. Monitor early warning indicators</li> <li>4. Target individual students with mentoring program</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

**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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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 include 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 middle 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. CCLR- Career College and Life Readiness Vocabulary will be featured on the morning news program.

**Part V: Budget**

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

<b>1 III.A. Areas of Focus: English Language Arts (ELA) \$334,463.00</b>						
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
5000	100-Salaries	0131 - Fruitville Elementary School	Title, I Part A	2.6	\$165,467.00	
<i>Notes: 1- Literacy Coach 1.6- Interventionist</i>						
6400	140-Substitute Teachers	0131 - Fruitville Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$30,000.00	
<i>Notes: Monthly Planning- Sub coverage for teachers</i>						
5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0131 - Fruitville Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$118,996.00	
<i>Notes: Supplementary Literacy materials(LLI kits, BAS kist, leveled libraries)</i>						
6400	330-Travel	0131 - Fruitville Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$20,000.00	
<i>Notes: Professional Development Conference</i>						
<b>2 III.A. Areas of Focus: Math \$14,000.00</b>						
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
5000	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0131 - Fruitville Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$14,000.00	
<i>Notes: Tutoring Contracts</i>						
<b>3 III.A. Areas of Focus: Science \$20,000.00</b>						
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0131 - Fruitville Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$20,000.00	
<i>Notes: Supplemental Science Kits to support instruction</i>						
<b>4 III.A. Areas of Focus: Social Emotional Learning \$29,689.00</b>						

Sarasota - 0131 - Fruitville Elementary School - 2019-20 SIP

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	2110	160-Other Support Personnel	0131 - Fruitville Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.4	\$24,370.00
			<i>Notes: Additional Guidance Counselor</i>			
	6150	500-Materials and Supplies	0131 - Fruitville Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$5,319.00
			<i>Notes: Parent Engagement Activities</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$398,152.00</b>