

Pinellas County Schools

Maximo Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Maximo Elementary School

4850 31ST ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

<http://www.maximoelementary.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Austin

Start Date for this Principal: 6/27/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: C (44%) 2014-15: F (15%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Pinellas County School Board on 9/10/2019.

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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Maximo Elementary School

4850 31ST ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

<http://www.maximoelementary.com/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 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	92%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	D	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Pinellas County School Board on 9/10/2019.

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.

The mission of Maximo Elementary School is to ensure rigorous educational opportunities, promote highest student achievement, and inspire students to become leaders beyond the classroom.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide every scholar with equitable and rigorous standards based instruction in order for him/her to successfully make at least a year's growth of learning.

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
Moses, Tekoa	Principal	
Riley, Cassandra	Instructional Coach	
Pe, Cheryl	Psychologist	
Woody, Patrick	Other	
Hall, Natasha	Instructional Coach	
Hutton, Carol	Instructional Coach	

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	51	85	75	82	65	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	414
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	7	7	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	5	8	8	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	27	17	55	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 in ELA	0	0	0	0	34	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 in Math	0	0	0	0	36	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
	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	4	27	25	43	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144

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	1	4	1	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

26

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/27/2019

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	12	8	11	9	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	1	2	3	4	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	19	33	27	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	1	1	0	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	12	8	11	9	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	1	2	3	4	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	19	33	27	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	1	1	0	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	30%	54%	57%	29%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	59%	58%	39%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	54%	53%	59%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	34%	61%	63%	36%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	61%	62%	49%	61%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	48%	51%	42%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	53%	53%	29%	53%	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	51 (0)	85 (0)	75 (0)	82 (0)	65 (0)	56 (0)	414 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (12)	4 (8)	7 (11)	7 (9)	4 (8)	4 (7)	26 (55)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	5 (2)	8 (3)	8 (4)	7 (11)	6 (2)	34 (23)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (1)	0 (5)	27 (19)	17 (33)	55 (27)	46 (11)	145 (96)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (13)	0 (24)	0 (37)
Level 1 in ELA	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	34 (0)	21 (0)	55 (0)
Level 1 in Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	36 (0)	31 (0)	67 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	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.

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	33%	56%	-23%	58%	-25%
	2018	22%	53%	-31%	57%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	29%	56%	-27%	58%	-29%
	2018	34%	51%	-17%	56%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	25%	54%	-29%	56%	-31%
	2018	25%	50%	-25%	55%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	34%	62%	-28%	62%	-28%
	2018	20%	62%	-42%	62%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	23%	64%	-41%	64%	-41%
	2018	27%	62%	-35%	62%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	39%	60%	-21%	60%	-21%
	2018	46%	61%	-15%	61%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	31%	54%	-23%	53%	-22%
	2018	30%	57%	-27%	55%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	17	50		25	65						
BLK	27	48	62	29	54	68	27				
HSP	50			58							
WHT	56	55		69	64						

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
FRL	29	50	65	29	52	68	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	9	27		22	20						
BLK	25	47	50	28	51	54	29				
HSP	36			55							
WHT	50	69		36	38						
FRL	29	51	48	33	48	50	31				
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	10	9		19	45						
BLK	27	39	68	33	46	45	21				
HSP				36							
WHT	38			46							
FRL	26	40	57	33	49	42	28				

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	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	330
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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	61
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	46
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the Math proficiency of scholars grades 3-5 according to Winter MAP. There seems to be a trend in the minimal improvements of mathematics achievement. The contributing factor to low performance was foundational skills in mathematics, inconsistent use of IPG's to provide teachers with standards -based feedback. According to Florida Standards Assessment and Every Student Succeeds Act 2018/2019 scholars with disabilities showed the lowest performance.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was the learning gains of the Lowest 25 scholars in both English Language Arts and Math according to the Winter MAP results. The factors contributing to this decline included a need to plan for corrective instruction for L25 scholars (intervention hour), monitoring iReady minutes in English Language Arts and Math,

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that showed the greatest gap in comparison to the state average was the proficiency and gains of our students with disabilities. The factors that contributed to this gap was a need for consistent collaborative planning between classroom teachers and teachers of students with disabilities.

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

The data component that displayed the greatest improvement was the learning gains of our L25 scholars in math. The actions the school took included a focus on the aspects of rigor, target-task alignment, collaborative planning, and focus on the major work of the grade level.

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

Scholar proficiency in reading and math
Proficiency and learning gains of scholars with disabilities

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

1. Students with disabilities
2. English Language Arts proficiency
3. Math proficiency
4. English Language Arts learning gains
5. Science achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Culture of Engagement
Rationale	A culture of engagement was selected because when looking at our data, our area of focus centered on the need to increase scholar proficiency, teacher knowledge of standards, scholar autonomy, family engagement, and community partnerships.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Presently we have 31% of scholars proficient in ELA. Presently we have 34% of scholars proficient in Math. Presently we have 34% of scholars proficient in Science. Through high quality standards based instruction 45% of our scholars will be proficient by the 2019/2020 school year with 70% percent learning gains in ELA, Math, and L25.. Presently we have 30%-40% of our parents who attend school events. Through project-based learning, community partnerships, and parental engagement events we will increase the number of stakeholders who regularly engage in school events to 50% by the end of the 2019/2020 school year.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Empower ELA champions/cohort teachers to develop as literacy leaders</p> <p>Utilize multiple forms of assessment, data analysis, corrective instruction action planning, and monitoring second chance instruction to inform mathematics instruction.</p> <p>Unpack grade level standards during PLC's. Support and utilize formal and informal assessment strategies that inform instruction. Identify proficiency levels and implement instructional strategies to increase conceptual development of key content.</p>
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Facilitate project-based learning professional development through monthly curriculum meetings and weekly PLC's.</p> <p>Facilitate monthly professional development on Karen Mapp strategies and book study Beyond the Bake Sale</p> <p>The Equity Team will facilitate professional development through monthly curriculum meetings and weekly Professional Learning Communities around the Four Drivers of Equity and the Bridging the Gap Plan.</p> <p>To provide African-American scholars with an equitable and rigorous standards based instruction in order for him/her to successfully make at least a year's worth of growth.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Empowering ELA Champions as literacy leaders will provide the opportunity for teachers to co-facilitate PD sessions alongside administrators and ELA coach, open classrooms for observations, and coach colleagues in literacy practices ultimately increasing ELA proficiency.</p> <p>Unpacking standards and utilizing multiple formal and informal assessments (ex. Exit tickets, MFAS, and Illustrative Mathematics tasks, and student work analysis) will provide</p>

teachers with corrective instruction information to inform teaching and learning.

Through facilitating monthly PD on project based learning we will increase scholar engagement, provide more rigorous communication skills, increase student autonomy, integrate standards across curriculum, and provide more opportunities for the school, families, and community to authentically engage.

Facilitating monthly professional development around the Karen Mapp Beyond the Bake Sale study will inspire teachers and families to form powerful learning partnerships to enhance student performance.

Facilitating professional development around the Three Drivers of Equity will provide a structure for reflection, courageous conversations, and adaptive change.

Increase proficiency of African-American scholars in order to close the achievement gap between black and non-black scholars as outlined in the Bridging the Gap Plan.

Action Step

1. ELA Champions and Math Champions will attend monthly professional development, side by side coaching with ELA coach, and learn to complete IPG's. Teachers will attend Standards-based professional development (ELA, Math, and Science) for teachers with a focus on equity grounded within the shifts. (ex. unpacking the standards utilizing A-Net, Standards Institute, NCTM, Tennessee Visits,...)
2. Identify, share vision, and plan with teachers,community leaders and partners utilizing the National Academy Foundation Partnerships for America's Youth Project-Based Learning Framework. (Karen Mapp. Harvard, Ron Clark Academy, Tennessee visits)
3. Collaborate, design and develop focus groups to merge community and project-based learning (Farm to School Grant, Edible Peace Patch partnership with Eckerd College)
4. Continue the implementation of PBIS, Restorative Practices, scholar, and teacher celebrations (Ron Clark Academy, Three Drivers of Equity, Equity Champions)
5. Calendar professional development around the Three Drivers of Equity

Description

Person Responsible Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Culture of Healthy Learning
Rationale	To develop and sustain a healthy, respectful, caring, and safe learning environment for scholars, staff, and the community.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Maximo Elementary will receive Bronze Level recognition by the end of the 2019/2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Informing scholars, staff, and the community about healthier living using The American Alliance for a Healthier Generation Resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Studies show healthier scholars and stakeholders perform better, attend more often, and are able to socially and emotionally cope ultimately empowering them to be healthier active citizens.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monthly Wellness Meeting 2. Morning Mile Club implemented by physical education department (weekly) 3. Staff participates in Wellness Initiatives 4. Project-based learning- Farm to table
Person Responsible	Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)

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).

Through a culture of engagement (including all stakeholders) we will focus on:

- Standards-based Instruction
- Project-based Learning
- Equitable Practices
- Collaborative Planning
- IPG's (Instructional Practice Guides)
- K-2 Early Literacy
- Real-time Coaching
- Interim Assessments/Formative Assessments

With a focus on the above mentioned strategies we will increase scholar proficiency and prepare scholars for college and career positively impacting scholars with disabilities, ELA, Math, and Science proficiency.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture of Engagement				\$2,260.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	2281 - Maximo Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,260.00
			<i>Notes: Provide funds for stipends for teachers to attend professional development beyond the contracted day and school year.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture of Healthy Learning				\$0.00
					Total:	\$2,260.00