

The School District of Palm Beach County

Addison Mizner 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	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Addison Mizner School

199 SW 12TH AVE, Boca Raton, FL 33486

<https://ames.palmbeachschools.org>

Demographics

Principal: Nancy Holly

Start Date for this Principal: 10/5/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	31%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (74%) 2014-15: A (84%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Palm Beach 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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Addison Mizner School

199 SW 12TH AVE, Boca Raton, FL 33486

<https://ames.palmbeachschools.org>

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)
Combination School KG-8	No	30%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

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 Palm Beach 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.

Addison Mizner is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Addison Mizner envisions students that are able to make well-reasoned, thoughtful and healthy life-long decisions in an ever-changing world. We further believe that all students can learn and be successful, and we will provide proper instruction in a supportive and safe environment to meet this goal.

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
Davidow, Joshua	Principal	Mr. Davidow will monitor the literacy based implementation to adhere to the action steps within each classroom as stipulated within the School Improvement Plan.
Boone, Joe	Assistant Principal	Dr. Boone will oversee the implementation of differentiated instruction in each classroom to support struggling students and monitor the results of FSQs and USAs of each student.
Parkinson, Renee	Teacher, ESE	Renee Parkinson will monitor the progress of ESE students and SBT referrals.
Seiger, Randi	School Counselor	Randi Seiger will utilize social and emotional learning through guidance and small groups to support student academic growth.
Lamprecht, Lori	Teacher, K-12	Lori Lamprecht will work with the struggling readers primarily in grades 1-3 and closely monitor the progress of all struggling readers throughout the school.
Harrington, Margaret	Teacher, K-12	Margaret Harrington will monitor the ELL students curriculum and support them in the classroom.
Dlugos, Shantel	Teacher, K-12	Shantel Dlugos is the SAC Chair and works with the alignment of testing.

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	144	141	138	165	146	151	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	885
Attendance below 90 percent	12	4	9	2	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	20	17	23	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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		3	1	2	11	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year		1	0	4	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

60

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/23/2019

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	10	16	13	9	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	19	22	3	15	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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		2	3	0	12	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	10	16	13	9	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	19	22	3	15	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	2	3	0	12	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	81%	56%	61%	84%	46%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	76%	58%	59%	68%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	55%	54%	63%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	87%	53%	62%	85%	43%	58%
Math Learning Gains	73%	55%	59%	64%	48%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%	52%	52%	64%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	77%	45%	56%	77%	41%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	75%	78%	0%	67%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	144 (0)	141 (0)	138 (0)	165 (0)	146 (0)	151 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	885 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	12 (10)	4 (16)	9 (13)	2 (9)	12 (12)	10 (16)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	49 (76)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	1 (0)	0 (2)	0 (2)	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (6)
Course failure in ELA or Math	9 (19)	20 (22)	17 (3)	23 (15)	7 (0)	4 (7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	80 (66)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (14)	7 (16)	18 (12)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	39 (42)

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	75%	54%	21%	58%	17%
	2018	84%	56%	28%	57%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	62%	20%	58%	24%
	2018	78%	58%	20%	56%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	80%	59%	21%	56%	24%
	2018	85%	59%	26%	55%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	85%	65%	20%	62%	23%
	2018	82%	63%	19%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	94%	67%	27%	64%	30%
	2018	84%	63%	21%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	82%	65%	17%	60%	22%
	2018	90%	66%	24%	61%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2019	100%	60%	40%	55%	45%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	100%	56%	44%	52%	48%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-100%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	77%	51%	26%	53%	24%
	2018	84%	56%	28%	55%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	45	60	48	65	72	66	39				
ELL	63	92	88	89	77	92	73				
ASN	80			100							
BLK	62			77							
HSP	78	78	76	78	73	60	61				
MUL	76	75		90	50						
WHT	83	75	62	91	75	83	82				
FRL	71	74	68	78	72	70	60				

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	48	46	42	55	56	48	65				
ELL	58	56	55	68	75	70					
ASN	100	100		100	91						
HSP	81	60	46	84	75	68	80				
MUL	88	73		88	64						
WHT	84	69	61	87	74	74	86				
FRL	74	61	55	79	67	69	74				

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	54	63	46	53	48	38	47				
ELL	67	73		75	73						
HSP	82	70	63	82	63	67	75				
MUL	88			76							
WHT	84	66	61	86	64	63	77				
FRL	77	71	59	78	66	80	60				

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	77

ESSA Federal Index	
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	84
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	617
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
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	82
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	70
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	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	73
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	80
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	72
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.

When looking at our data and comparing one year from the next, our English Language Arts in grades 3-5 declined by 3%. Our subgroup data is indicating that FRL decreased by 3%, White by 7%, Multiracial by 12%, Hispanic by 3% in ELA proficiency. Our math achievement stayed the same at 87% proficiency. Science proficiency declined by 7%. The contributing factor toward the decline in ELA and science was new teachers to third and fifth grade resulting in less familiarity with the standards producing less rigor within the lessons.

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

Our greatest decline was English Language Arts proficiency by 3%. The factors that contributed to this decline was 3rd grade ELA decreased by 9% and 5th grade ELA decreased by 5%. This is a result of new teachers to the third and fifth grade ELA content, therefore not teaching to the intent of the standard. Math proficiency stayed the same, math learning gains and the lowest 25% math learning gains decreased by 1%.

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.

In comparison to the state, our school has experienced greater achievement in all areas.

- * ELA +24% achievement
- * ELA Learning Gains +18%
- * ELA Lowest 25% + 14%
- * Math +24% achievement
- * Math Learning Gains +11%
- * Math Lowest 25% +21%
- * Science achievement +24%

The factors that affect our overall greater achievement than the state is that teachers use PLCs to collaborate on lessons, analyze data to drive their instruction, and remediate student's areas of need.

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

When looking at our school data we increased 10% in ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% and increased 7% for ELA learning gains. Looking at our grade level data, 4th grade increased 4% in ELA compared to last year's 4th graders. The 5th grade cohort increased 2% in ELA. In math, 4th grade increased 10% compared to last year's 4th graders and the cohort increased 12%. The new actions our school took in this area was to differentiate instruction for all students by creating equitable lessons so all students have the opportunity to learn at their level by giving them the supports to obtain mastery.

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

When looking at Early Warning Systems, one potential area of concern are the number of students with course failures in ELA and math. Using formative assessments (FSQs and USAs), will target those students for remediation to decrease the number of level ones on FSA ELA and math.

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

1. Increase reading on grade level by third grade in alignment with LTO#1.
2. Increase overall ELA proficiency for grades 3-5.
3. Utilize FUNdations in grades K-2 to increase phonemic awareness, spelling, fluency, and vocabulary development.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase reading third grade proficiency to ensure progress towards student achievement within ELA proficiency to support the expectations of Long Term Outcome #1.
Rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Third grade showed the greatest declines from 2018-2019 in ELA proficiency (-9). - This area of focus aligns with the District Strategic Plan to increase reading on grade level to 75% and ensure 75% high school readiness.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our measurable goals for FY20 will be to have a 10 point increase for our third grade ELA. This would be an increase from 75% to 85% in ELA. In ELA proficiency our goal is to make up the 9 point decline, plus add an additional point, bringing us to 85% ELA proficiency for FY20.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joshua Davidow (joshua.davidow@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Classroom teachers will engage in standard base planning during Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model. a). (Plan) Look at present ELA levels and determine what students need to learn; b). (Do) Align standards to appropriate teaching methods and strategies that monitor the student for learning c). (Reflect) Align to student evidence to standard; d). (Revise) Remediate if student is not making enough progress within the standard; e). (Check) Use formative assessments to determine the amount of learning that took place. (Mr. Davidow). 2. Strengthen core instruction by utilizing units of study, iReady lessons, and FUNdations Standard Lesson. (Mr. Davidow) 3. Utilize small group differentiated instruction using guided reading, small group shared reading, and skill/strategy groups. (Mr. Davidow) 4. Use intervention strategies such as Level Literacy Intervention (LLI), FUNdations, and iReady Tools for Instruction to remediate students. (Dr. Boone) 5. Target low performing students in K-2 using Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), FUNdations Double Dose, and iReady Tools for Instruction. (Mr. Davidow) <p>1 & 2. Standard Based instruction and collaborative planning (PLCs) holds teachers and the school accountable. The practice of aligning the standard to the student evidence ensures students are exposed to the level of rigor to be successful on standardized testing. Keeps teachers on track with the scope and sequence so all students have an opportunity to be successful.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>3. Differentiated instruction creates an equitable culture within the classroom so all students have an opportunity to be successful and make progress toward the standard at their own pace.</p> <p>4 & 5. IReady offers lessons that support students reading skill level based on their diagnostic given three times a year. FUNdations instructs students on phonemic awareness, decoding, spelling, and vocabulary development. Leveled Literacy Interventions gives students opportunities to work in small groups while engaging on leveled books.</p>

Action Step	
Description	1 & 2. Teachers will meet on a planned rotational basis during Professional Learning Communities to review standards, analyze data demonstrating standards mastery, align student evidence with standard, and determine next steps within the instruction of standards.

3. Teachers will attend Professional Development to strengthen their knowledge of literacy instruction to provide remediation for struggling students.
 4. IReady will be offered within all grade level classrooms with the use of Chromebooks, lap top carts, and computer labs within the school. All students will be expected to utilize the program 45 minutes a week for ELA.
 5. Tutoring will be offered to enrich and remediate students to meet their targeted FSA goals.
- All the action steps will be monitored through student data analysis, classroom rigor walks, and lesson plan review.

Person Responsible Joshua Davidow (joshua.davidow@palmbeachschools.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).

In alignment with the District's Strategic Plan and with the goal to increase academic instruction of all students - Students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards including the content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a Single School Culture of excellence in Academics, behavior, and climate with an appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. policy 2.09 with a focus on the instruction of the:

- (a) History of the Holocaust,
- (b) History of Africans and African Americans
- (c) Study of the contributions of Hispanics
- (d) Study of Women contributions
- (e) Sacrifices of Veterans in serving our country.

Additional content required instruction by Florida Statute 1003.42(2), as applicable to appropriate grade levels include,

- Declaration of Independence
- Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights
- Character Development program with curriculum to address: responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect; caring; and fairness.

This content is integrated and delivered through the English Language Arts block. Teachers collaborate during Professional Learning Communities to ensure content is delivered with validity.

Our school integrates a Single School Culture using the Universal Guidelines for Success following the Behavior Matrix using the (STAR) where students are responsible, respectful, and ready to learn., Teachers will articulate, demonstrate, and teach the specific practices that reflect the application of the school's SwPBS universal guidelines. Adults across the campus will clarify their expectations for positive interpersonal interaction and create the structures for a single school culture of excellence.

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.

The principal builds positive relationships with parents by sending out a weekly newsletter to notify about upcoming events and opportunities.

Parents, families, and community stakeholders are encouraged to attend monthly SAC and PTA meetings to gain insight and share input about the school's success. Volunteers give many hours of support to our teachers and administration.

Parents attend Open House, Back to School Night, and parent conferences to show their support and be an integral part of their child's education.

Community events such as Family Fun Day and Spirit Night encourage families and community members to be an active participant in the school community.

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.

Parents are provided with information about Addison Mizner and how it promotes academic achievement as well as social and emotional development through the use of a Single School Culture. The school has a full time Mental Health Counselor and Guidance Counselor. Both work collaboratively to offer social and emotional support to students in need or if a serious situation may arise.

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

The principal works directly with area preschools to provide a guideline of expectations so children can be "kindergarten ready". In the Spring, students and parents are invited to the Kindergarten Round-up. Addison Mizner also supports the 5th graders as they transition into Middle School. Each year the middle schools are invited to present their choice programs so that families can make informed decisions about the educational path their children will choose. The school also supports students as they make visits to prospective schools.

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 principal facilitates and monitors to ensure an effective academic program is in place through classroom rigor walks. The administration has ongoing communication with teachers, students, and parents to ensure all students' academic needs are met.

The School Based Team (SBT) meets weekly to discuss student progress and ensure students are working on interventions that meet the intent of the grade level standards. The team discusses student data within each level of tiers to determine the next steps for the student to be successful. The principal also collaborates with the team to ensure that the implementation of the intervention, support, and enrichment are provided and documented.

Our school uses a Single School Culture by ensuring all teachers use the Universal Guidelines in the classroom following the Behavior Matrix which includes communicating with parents and monitoring students behavior. We implement SwPBS programs in the cafeteria and in the classroom to promote positive behavior for all students.

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

Our students are given the opportunity for enrichment through our Accelerated Math Program which begins in third grade. The school establishes community and business partnerships with Mathnasium, Youngmakers Lab, Mad Science, Mind Games, Spanish, and Kid Music. These programs give students enrichment opportunities outside the classroom leading to college and career success.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase reading third grade proficiency to ensure progress towards student achievement within ELA proficiency to support the expectations of Long Term Outcome #1.				\$3,176.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1451 - Addison Mizner School	School Improvement Funds	851.0	\$3,176.00
			<i>Notes: The SIP funds will be utilized for a program or process to support student achievement and will be determined by SAC.</i>			
					Total:	\$3,176.00