

Sarasota County Schools

Southside 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Southside Elementary School

1901 WEBBER ST, Sarasota, FL 34239

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/southside

Demographics

Principal: Jamie Hannon

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (70%) 2014-15: A (86%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Southside Elementary School

1901 WEBBER ST, Sarasota, FL 34239

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/southside

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 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	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.

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! (Navigating a new course everyday to ensure excellence.)

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
Nzeza, Jennifer	Principal	<p>The Principal of Southside Elementary School serves as the instructional leader for the school, which includes creating a leadership team comprised of teachers representing each grade level and department within the school. The team meets each week to discuss academic and procedural topics, implement the SIP, and facilitate PBS/Rtl. Additionally, the principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing Rtl; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation and makes sure adequate professional development is offered to support Rtl implementation. The principal communicates with parents on a regular basis and oversees building operational decisions. The Principal also serves as the instructional leader for the administrative team which meets regularly to discuss academic and procedural topics.</p>
West , Carol	Teacher, K-12	<p>General Education Teacher - Represents First Grade on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).</p>
Miller, Kent	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal works directly with the principal to provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making; ensure that the school-based team is implementing Rtl; ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation to make sure adequate professional development is offered to support Rtl implementation; communicate with parents regarding school based Rtl plans and activities, and oversee building operational decisions. The Assistant Principal also serves as an instructional leader on the leadership team, which meets weekly to discuss academic and procedural topics.</p>
DeNegris, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	<p>General Education Teacher - Represents Third Grade on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Holman , Stacey	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents Fourth Grade on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Stewart, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents Second Grade on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Buffaloe, Krista	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents Kindergarten on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Bancker.Erickson, Stephanie	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Liaison represents the ESE department on the School Leadership team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Eicher, Christina	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents Fifth Grade on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Alba, Lorri	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents Specials Teachers on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Lugannani, Kim	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor serves on the School Leadership Team. The School Leadership Team meets weekly with the Principal and Assistant Principal to discuss academic and procedural topics, implement the SIP plan, and facilitate PBS/Rtl as a related, but distinct process from the CARE (Children at Risk in Education) eligibility determination process. Every member of the team has an equal voice and decisions are made through consensus and data driven decision making.

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	98	136	112	131	116	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	694
Attendance below 90 percent	1	9	13	8	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

56

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/13/2019

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	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 with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	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 with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	83%	68%	57%	88%	68%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	62%	58%	75%	63%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	53%	53%	68%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	88%	73%	63%	87%	72%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	67%	62%	80%	68%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	53%	51%	75%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	79%	65%	53%	85%	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	98 (0)	136 (0)	112 (0)	131 (0)	116 (0)	101 (0)	694 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 (11)	9 (10)	13 (7)	8 (6)	9 (14)	6 (19)	46 (67)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (2)	0 (1)	1 (4)	1 (9)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (5)	4 (12)	4 (14)	13 (31)

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	82%	70%	12%	58%	24%
	2018	94%	68%	26%	57%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	92%	67%	25%	58%	34%
	2018	84%	67%	17%	56%	28%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	79%	68%	11%	56%	23%
	2018	81%	66%	15%	55%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	88%	73%	15%	62%	26%
	2018	86%	72%	14%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	72%	17%	64%	25%
	2018	83%	71%	12%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	88%	70%	18%	60%	28%
	2018	81%	72%	9%	61%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	78%	65%	13%	53%	25%
	2018	79%	67%	12%	55%	24%
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	42	46	39	44	58	62	23				
ELL	47			79							
HSP	73	56		83	81		65				
MUL	77	57		91	71		73				
WHT	87	71	64	89	81	65	84				
FRL	78	64	60	84	76	74	54				

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				

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	76
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	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	610
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	68
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	72
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	74
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	77
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	71
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.

English Language Arts Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% - This is not a trend from 2018 because we saw a 15% gain in this area. However, some of the contributing factors have been the fact that historically our Students With Disabilities have performed below the other subgroups. We believe this is due to the pull out model previously used at Southside for this subgroup.

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

Overall English Language Arts Achievement showed the greatest decline. As a school there was a 2% decline from 2018 data to the 2019 data. This is due to a significant decline in our 3rd grade ELA performance (a 12% drop in proficiency). We believe that the make-up of the 3rd grade student body related to behavior, class size, and need for additional academic and social support led to the decline.

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.

We are happy to report that we are above the state average in every data component.

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

The Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% is the area where we saw the most improvement. We believe we saw great gains here due to the professional development offered by our district math specialists and the implementation of the PD in classrooms. In addition, our teachers conducted a closer analysis of iReady data as well as Standards Mastery data to target their math instruction. Through collaborative planning, teachers made executive decisions related to the sequencing of curriculum which ultimately benefited students.

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

One area of concern is the number of students that were retained (K-1, 1st-2, 3rd-5 for a total of 8 students).

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

1. Increasing the overall performance of Students With Disabilities
2. Providing refinement of and clarity to teachers related to the intervention process.

3. Enhancing opportunities and outlets as well as developing the depth and breadth of Science exposure and experiences to students K-5.

4.

5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Increasing the overall performance of Students With Disabilities

Rationale Even though this subgroup of students made gains from the previous school year, they performed the lowest in all school grade components in comparison to their peers.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

A 10 point increase in English Language Arts learning gains (46 to 56) and learning gains for the lowest 25% (39 to 49).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy

Targeted, small-group instruction based on data analysis using the inclusion model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

This model for ESE instruction was implemented on a smaller scale in 2018-2019 based on nation-wide research on its effectiveness. We saw benefits for our students as the teacher and ESE teacher worked together versus in isolation. Teacher feedback on the model was positive. As such, this year an ESE inclusion model was implemented school wide. We did this because the achievement level of our Students With Disabilities is not on par with their peers. We used data analysis of FSA, iReady, and classroom assessments and anecdotes to make this determination.

Action Step

Description

1. Provide training with Mandy Coker and FDLRS for instructional staff and para professionals in the model and small group instruction.
2. Design a master schedule to provide inclusion support required for the model.
3. Allow flexible classroom design to accommodate small groups needed for the model.
4. Provide resources and personnel to support reading and math instruction.
5. Observations and follow-up meeting regarding the success of implementation.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2	
Title	Providing refinement of and clarity to teachers related to the intervention process.
Rationale	Teachers and SWST/CARE team members have expressed the need for clarity in this area as the MTSS and RTI process have evolved over the years.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase clarity of procedures and processes related to interventions as measurable by data and discussions at MTSS Data Chats and SWST/CARE Meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kent Miller (kent.miller@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Greater education and use of district provided Decision Trees and Striving Reader website.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for this strategy is to ensure that all students are receiving appropriate, research-based interventions to help close the achievement gap. We used the Early Warning Systems data to make this determination (chronic absences, retentions, suspensions, and Level 1s and 2s).
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. District provided MTSS & Responsive Instruction training in Decision Trees and the Striving Reader Website. 2. Discussions and Curriculum Leader Meeting and Faculty Meetings. 3. Monitor CPT notes. 4. Monitor students of concern at SWST/CARE and MTSS Data Chats. 5.
Person Responsible	Kim Lugannani (kim.lugannani@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3	
Title	Enhancing opportunities and outlets as well as developing the depth and breadth of science exposure and experiences to students K-5
Rationale	For three out of the last four years our Science FCAT scores have been below 80% proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Reach 80% or above proficiency on the Science FCAT for 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Infuse science vocabulary throughout the curriculum, increase the number of students participating in the STEM fair, and requiring scientific investigation by exposing student the scientific method beginning in grade K.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy is mostly flat Science FCAT scores. We used FCAT scores from the last four years.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce K-1 students to the scientific method and complete a full scientific investigation of various topics during science wheel. 2. Require 2nd grade students to complete a STEM fair project as a class and 3rd through 5th grade as small groups or individuals and compete in the STEM Fair. 3. Introduce Science vocabulary words on the morning news show and then post those word in the cafeteria on the Science Word Wall for all to see and refer to. 4. Purchase Science materials for grades K-5 to support our new Science curriculum. 5. Offer Science training with Cherie Dame.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@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).

We will address the remaining school-wide improvement priorities as we have done in 2018-2019. We will:

1. Use iReady to determine instructional priorities (this year we will add use of Standards Mastery Assessments)
2. Intensive ELA FSA preparation for 3rd-5th grade (and hopefully add math).
3. Use ongoing observations, data analysis, and feedback from classroom teachers.

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.

Southside Elementary School has one of the highest levels of parent involvement in the district's elementary schools. Maintaining the high level of parent involvement is targeted by working with the PTO, Southside Foundation for the Arts and F.B.I. (Fathers Being Involved) to offer many volunteer opportunities at our school for our parents. We also have a strong Reading Partners Program, a Green Team garden parents group, and parents offering after-school clubs.

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.

Counselors provide small group counseling in areas such as: anger management, divorce, grief and loss, etc. Students are pulled individually and/or in small groups as needed. Classroom Guidance lessons are provided. Additionally many students are mentored through our Reading Partner program which fosters positive relationships between a student and an adult while focusing on developing reading skills and strategies.

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

We provide numerous tours to incoming Kindergarten families and conduct a Kindergarten Orientation each spring. Additionally, our fifth graders have an opportunity to visit area middle schools and attend their parent orientation evenings.

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 Leadership team identifies and aligns available resources as needed throughout the year to help maintain and improve student achievement. As a non-title I school, funding sources are limited. An inventory of Capital Outlay purchases greater than \$750 are included in the school's annual fixed asset inventory, which the school has maintained at 100 percent. The Capital Outlay dollars that are allocated to the school are used to enhance the overall learning environment. School Administration and Leadership Team meet weekly to discuss the above.

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

Fifth grade students have the opportunity to learn about careers by participating in an annual experiential learning activity which culminates in a trip to Biz Town in Tampa. Students learn about economics and various careers and businesses. Our students learn about careers through the "Quest Kickoff" in their Science Textbooks. We have a STEM night at which students can learn about careers in science. Our second grade students learn about careers in the classroom when parent volunteers present about their careers.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing the overall performance of Students With Disabilities				\$219.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0191 - Southside Elementary School	General Fund		\$219.00
			<i>Notes: Training provided over the summer to our instructional staff in the inclusion model.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Providing refinement of and clarity to teachers related to the intervention process.				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Enhancing opportunities and outlets as well as developing the depth and breadth of science exposure and experiences to students K-5				\$6,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1142	239-Other	0191 - Southside Elementary School	Other		\$6,000.00
			<i>Notes: Each grade level K-5 was given \$1000 from the Science Club Funds in our internal account to purchase Science materials</i>			
Total:						\$13,219.00