

Martin County School District

# Port Salerno Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# Port Salerno Elementary School

3260 SE LIONEL TER, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/pses

## Demographics

**Principal: Lauren Gifford**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/24/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (42%) 2014-15: C (41%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* 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 Martin County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# Port Salerno Elementary School

3260 SE LIONEL TER, Stuart, FL 34997

[martinschools.org/o/pses](http://martinschools.org/o/pses)

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	85%

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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.**

Port Salerno Elementary School is one big community- we work together to help each other. Teamwork achieves a better learning environment for all students by building character and motivating kids to learn.

Martin County School District mission: Educating all students for success.

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

Learning is active, fun and meaningful at Port Salerno Elementary School.

Martin County School District vision: A dynamic educational system of 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
Eberst, Allysa	Principal	
Gumbinner, Diane	School Counselor	
Wardle, Diane	Instructional Coach	
Gifford, Lauren	Assistant Principal	
Garcia, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Shaffer, David	Assistant Principal	
Lucrezia, Melissa	Instructional Coach	
McKerlie, Meagan	Teacher, ESE	ESE Support Facilitator
Miles, Carolyn	School Counselor	
	Instructional Coach	
Bagley, Nicole	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	126	136	124	171	107	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	783
Attendance below 90 percent	19	18	11	18	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	27	45	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

**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	1	0	25	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

**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	3	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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

45

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

Thursday 9/26/2019

**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	24	17	11	14	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	28	40	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109

**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	1	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

**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	24	17	11	14	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	28	40	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109

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	1	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

## 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	36%	58%	57%	28%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	59%	58%	47%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	56%	53%	51%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	40%	65%	63%	42%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	47%	65%	62%	55%	67%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	53%	51%	46%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	26%	58%	53%	27%	55%	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	126 (0)	136 (0)	124 (0)	171 (0)	107 (0)	119 (0)	783 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	19 (24)	18 (17)	11 (11)	18 (14)	8 (10)	14 (13)	88 (89)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	3 (1)	0 (1)	3 (2)	4 (0)	0 (0)	10 (4)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	23 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	26 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	27 (28)	45 (40)	52 (41)	124 (109)

### 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	27%	54%	-27%	58%	-31%
	2018	37%	57%	-20%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	57%	-16%	58%	-17%
	2018	34%	55%	-21%	56%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	33%	55%	-22%	56%	-23%
	2018	30%	58%	-28%	55%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	33%	58%	-25%	62%	-29%
	2018	38%	63%	-25%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	67%	-19%	64%	-16%
	2018	44%	64%	-20%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	30%	64%	-34%	60%	-30%
	2018	33%	64%	-31%	61%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	24%	53%	-29%	53%	-29%
	2018	18%	54%	-36%	55%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	31	33	21	39	44	36	14				

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
ELL	31	45	51	33	45	45	22				
BLK	21	53		31	33						
HSP	33	47	52	35	46	49	22				
WHT	62	60		70	57		53				
FRL	35	49	56	38	45	43	21				
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	33	50	42	37	38		24				
ELL	30	61	70	36	45	40	7				
BLK	8	41		24	35						
HSP	32	58	66	38	44	41	10				
MUL	36			18							
WHT	62	55		56	49	20	52				
FRL	36	56	61	40	44	38	19				
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	17	42	38	25	42	31	7				
ELL	21	50	60	39	61	50	17				
BLK	16	31		20	31						
HSP	24	49	61	41	60	50	20				
WHT	47	45		54	50		50				
FRL	27	48	51	41	56	43	27				

**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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

**Subgroup Data**

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	60
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	41
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.

PSE's lowest performing area was our 3rd grade English/Language Arts. 27% of our 3rd grade students scored proficient in ELA, which was 27% behind other MCSD 3rd graders, and 31% behind other Florida 3rd graders. This area was also a 10% decrease from where our 3rd grade students scored on the 2018 3rd grade ELA FSA section, although this is a different cohort of students. Some contributing factors to this low performance could be students entering 3rd grade lacking foundational skills to be successful in 3rd grade, as well as a large population of our students identified as English Language Learners. Another factor is our teachers needing continued and targeted professional development focused on grade level standards and the FSA test item specifications, to ensure their instruction is matching the rigor the standards and the FSA.

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

PSE saw the biggest decline in our 5th grade math cohort comparison. We saw a 14% decrease in proficiency, from 45% in 4th grade to 32% in 5th grade when comparing their Math FSA. Not only did this effect their proficiency scores, this also negatively impacted their learning gains scores, only 28% of our students made math learning gains. Some contributing factors included two new teachers to the grade level, inconsistency with rigor and instruction from 4th grade to fifth grade team, and a possible factor could be the increased focus on ELA achievement.

#### 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.

When comparing PSE to state averages, our biggest gap was with 3rd grade English/Language Arts. PSE students scored 27% proficient compared to 58% of Florida 3rd graders. Last year, our students proficiency was only 20% lower when compared to the state. Again, some contributing factors to this low performance could be students entering 3rd grade lacking foundational skills to be successful in 3rd grade, as well as a large population of our students identified as English Language Learners. In addition, our teachers need more professional development with the rigor of the standards for their grade level. Although teams are more stable for the 19-20 school year, there has been previously new staff in primary/foundational grades.

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

One data component that showed the most improvement is science achievement at 26%. In 2018 PSE's science achievement was 19% as compared to the 7-point increase in 2019. New actions that were taken in 2018:

- \* updates to master schedule reflecting specific time science with an increase of instructional minutes
- \* Made adjustments to the Science Lab on the Related Arts wheel so our lab teacher can support 5th grade students
- \* Lab teacher is reviewing tested 3rd and 4th grade standards with students in the science lab.
- \* Support for bubble students during the 5th grade Intervention block
- \* Optional Pre-School Day to work on planning the integration of science themed non-fiction text that match with grade level science standards into the ELA workshop and non-fiction reading strategies.
- \* Quarterly 5th grade planning day with focus on planning around science power standards.
- \* Using data to differentiate based on students/class need in relation to tested/power standards.
- \*?Aligning resources to the standards and collaboratively planning activities for each unit.
- \* Based off PMT2, teachers are going to create a Science WTS time to groups students

Another data component that showed improvement was our math lowest quartile. In 2019 learning gains in our math lowest quartile went from 38% to 45%.

- \* identify students that need intervention support through MTSS process
- \* Provide skill specific interventions: tier 2 and 3- strengthen PM tools
- \* Within PLC's and coaching cycle, teachers will collaborate and plan for differentiated instruction

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

Looking at the Early Warning System data, our biggest area of concern is our number of retainees; in 3rd grade, we had 28 who were retained due to scoring a level 1 on the ELA FSA. We also have 20 students grade 3 - 5 who have a double retention.

Another area of concern is our student attendance, especially for our primary (K-3) students. This past year we had 18 students in 1st and 3rd grade who had less than 90% attendance, and 19 students in kindergarten with less than 90% attendance.

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. ELA Lowest Quartile Gains
3. ESSA Subgroups:SWD, ELL, Black
4. Science Achievement
5. Math Achievement

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1

**Title** Reading Proficiency Grades K-2

**Rationale** Data shows that students in grades K-2 are not measuring at the proficiency level according to iReady diagnostic data.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** By June 2020, 55% of students in grades K-2 will be reading on or above grade level according to the third iReady diagnostic assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy** Provide experiences for our students that are explicit, systematic and multi-sensory instruction in phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary and oral language.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** Our school will implement instruction and strategies that are researched based to target identified early literacy skills. Data indicates the primary grade levels have demonstrated needs in the areas of phonics and phonemic awareness. The high population of English Language Learners at our school are in need of more oral language instruction and exposure.

#### Action Step

**Description**

1. Implement Foundations Phonics Instruction in grades K-2
2. Implement Heggerty's Phonemic Awareness in grades K-2
3. Incorporate small group instruction to include guided reading and strategy lessons
4. Implement Purposeful Language Acquisition Yields Success (P.L.A.Y.S. program) in Kindergarten classrooms.
5. Teachers College Professional Development with a focus on unit alignment to standards, vocabulary, and small group instruction
6. Provide small group support using Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI)
7. Implement Imagine Learning resources for small group instruction with ongoing PD support from Title 1 department.
8. Partnership with Americorps and Boys and Girls Club for small group layered support
9. 3 Full time literacy coaches to support teachers and their reading instruction. 1 Part time literacy coach to support new teachers and the balance literacy model.
10. Differentiated, targeted, student data driven instruction during additional ELA time
11. Ongoing PD on the Can-Do descriptors for ELL paras in conjunction with the Title 1 Dept.
12. CDL for each grade level team that supports team with data analysis, sub group monitoring, planning for rigorous standards based instruction.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Bagley (bagleyn@martin.k12.fl.us)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Reading Proficiency Grades 3-5
<b>Rationale</b>	Data shows that students in grades 3-5 are not measuring at the proficiency level according to the Florida Standards Assessment data.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By June 2020, 40% of students in grades 3-5 will score a level 2 or above according to the Florida Standards Assessment data.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Nicole Bagley (bageyn@martin.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Provide students the opportunities to interact with higher-level text, close achievement gaps and target individual needs based on school-wide and classroom data.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Our school will implement instruction and strategies that are researched based to target identified phonics, oral language and comprehension needs. Data indicates the intermediate grade levels have demonstrated needs in the areas of English language acquisition, phonics, vocabulary and comprehension.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide teachers with professional development from Teachers College at Columbia University.</li> <li>2. Implement small group instruction on guided reading and strategy groups based on data.</li> <li>3. Implement System 44 program for additional phonics instruction.</li> <li>4. Implement Imagine Learning resources for small group instruction.</li> <li>5. Provide small group support using Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI) for grade 3 retainees with literacy coaches.</li> <li>6. 3rd Grade alternative curriculum and schedule for retainees/L25 students</li> <li>7. Partnership with Americorps and Boys and Girls Club for small group layered support</li> <li>8. 3 Full time literacy coaches to support teachers and their reading instruction. 1 Part time literacy coach to support new teachers and the balance literacy model.</li> <li>9. Differentiated, targeted, student data driven instruction during additional ELA time</li> <li>10. Ongoing PD on the Can-Do descriptors for ELL paras in conjunction with the Title 1 Dept.</li> <li>11. Targeted intervention for ESE, black subgroup with daily intensive instruction delivered by IPS Coach.</li> <li>12. CDL for each grade level team that supports team with data analysis, sub group monitoring, planning for rigorous standards based instruction.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Melissa Lucrezia (lucrezm@martin.k12.fl.us)



<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Math Proficiency Grades K-2
<b>Rationale</b>	Data shows that students in grades K-2 are not measuring at the proficiency level according to iReady math diagnostic data in the domain of numbers and operations.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By May 2020, 55% of K-2 students will score at or above grade level in the math domain Numbers and Operations as measured by the iReady window 3 data.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	David Shaffer (shaffed@martin.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Provide instruction that focuses on work through the math model of concrete to representational to the final abstract component.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Employing strategies to support the learning of content-area vocabulary in classrooms will assist in increasing mathematical proficiency over all math domains.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will be provided professional development in 3 act tasks, number talk and vocabulary strategies to increase math discourse with real life strategies</li> <li>2. Professional development with iReady toolbox and MAFS books to use with number and operations lessons</li> <li>3. Differentiated small group and targeted interventions to meet individual needs</li> <li>4. Provide professional development on interactive journals and small group independent games within standards by district coaches</li> <li>5. New teacher support by mentors and district coaching</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]

<b>#4</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Math Proficiency Grades 3-5
<b>Rationale</b>	Data shows that students in grades 3-5 are not measuring at the proficiency level according to the Florida Standards Assessment data.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By May 2020, 42% of students will measure proficient in math as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment in the math domain of numbers and operations.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	David Shaffer (shaffed@martin.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Provide instruction that focuses on work through the math model of concrete to representational to the final abstract component.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Employing strategies to support the learning of content-area vocabulary in classrooms will assist in increasing mathematical proficiency over all math domains.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase mathematical mindsets of female students through STEM programs</li> <li>2. Provide cross grade level standard progression planning throughout the year</li> <li>3. Provide lesson study professional development to unwrap current standards and create small group instruction</li> <li>4. Provide professional development on interactive journals and small group independent games within standards</li> <li>5. Teachers will be provided professional development in 3 act tasks, number talk and vocabulary strategies to increase math discourse with real life strategies</li> <li>6. Differentiated small group and targeted interventions to meet individual needs</li> <li>7. New teacher support by mentors and district coaching</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]

<b>#5</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Nature of Science
<b>Rationale</b>	Data shows students in grade 5 are not measuring at the proficiency level according to Florida Statewide Science Assessment data.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By May 2020, 40% of students will measure proficient in science as measured by the Florida Statewide Science Assessment in the domain of nature of science.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Matries Florio (florion@martin.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Provide students opportunities to interact with science vocabulary, close achievement gaps and target individual needs based on school-wide and classroom data.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Employing strategies to support the learning of content-area vocabulary in classrooms and opportunities for hands on learning will assist in increasing science proficiency.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion of at least one grade level common lab experiment per nine weeks of school. Students will participate as partners or groups in hands on learning. Teachers worked with lab teacher to purchase materials for each grade level through SIP funds. Labs focus on Nature of Science standards as well as unit standards.</li> <li>2. Grade level science rotations to review standards prior to unit assessments, as well as after assessments to remediate students based off needs identified from the assessments.</li> <li>3. Implement usage of Spanish cognates along with pictures during vocabulary instruction.</li> <li>4. Science lab teacher pushing into 5th grade intervention time to push proficiency, focusing on subgroups including Black males, Hispanic females, and Hispanic males.</li> <li>5. Increase mathematical mindsets of female students through STEM programs</li> <li>6. Implement <a href="http://www.floridastudents.org">www.floridastudents.org</a> science tutorials for students in grades 3-5 to complete during related arts rotation of computer lab.</li> <li>8. Quarterly 5th grade planning day with focus on inquiry based projects around science power standards.</li> <li>9. 5th grade students focusing on power 3rd and 4th grade standards in the science lab to review standards that are more than likely to be tested on their Science SSA.</li> <li>9. Provide teachers with science professional development from the District Science Coordinator.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Matries Florio (florion@martin.k12.fl.us)

<b>#6</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Life Science
<b>Rationale</b>	Data shows students in grade 5 are not measuring at the proficiency level according to Florida Statewide Science Assessment data.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By May 2020, 40% of students will measure proficient in science as measured by the Florida Statewide Science Assessment in the domain of life science.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Matries Florio (floriom@martin.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Provide students with opportunities to interact with science vocabulary, close achievement gaps and target individual needs based on school-wide and classroom data.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Employing strategies to support the learning of content-area vocabulary in classrooms and providing opportunities for hands on learning will assist in increasing science proficiency
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion of at least one grade level common lab experiment per nine weeks of school.</li> <li>2. Grade level science rotations to review standards prior to unit assessments.</li> <li>3. Implement usage of Spanish cognates along with pictures during vocabulary instruction.</li> <li>4. Science intervention groups to remediate low achieving subgroups including Black males, Hispanic females, and Hispanic males.</li> <li>5. Implement www.floridastudents.org science tutorials for students in grades 3-5 to complete during related arts rotation of computer lab.</li> <li>6. Quarterly 5th grade planning day with focus on inquiry based projects around science power standards.</li> <li>7. Provide teachers with science professional development from the District Science Coordinator.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Matries Florio (floriom@martin.k12.fl.us)

**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).**

Collaborative Data Liaisons (CDL) have been named in each grade level. CDLs attended a training in the summer to prepare for their work this school year within their professional learning communities. The CDLs have been tasked with helping teams refocus on the four driving questions, analyzing data, and supporting the sharing of resources for quality instruction. Grade level teams are also create data walls on flip charts to aid their conversations about students and their academic progress during PLC times. Teams also created grade level action plans to set goals and guide their work for the school-year.

All teachers were given their prior year data and a reflection tool to identify areas of strength and weaknesses. Teachers where then tasked in using this tool in guiding their deliberate practice for the 2019-2020 school year, focusing on their lowest quartile students, student proficiency, and strategic lesson planning.

We've worked our Title I/ ELL Department on training our teachers and paraprofessional to analyze the students' Access 2.0 scores and design small group intentional lessons, based off their domain scores and the WIDA "Can Do" descriptors.

## 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.**

100% of parents will participate in at least one event at Port Salerno Elementary during the 2019-2020 school year.

#### PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

The social-emotional needs of all students are being met in many ways at Port Salerno Elementary. All students also have access to the school counselors at anytime for any social or emotional need. The school can also make referrals to the school social service worker for further supports. Port Salerno Elementary has access to refer students for school supplies, clothing or medical needs to help support their social-emotional needs.

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

Port Salerno Elementary notifies local preschool programs in the spring to schedule tours for incoming kindergartners.

At Port Salerno Elementary, all incoming Kindergarten students are assessed prior to or upon entering Kindergarten in order to ascertain individual and group needs.

Port Salerno Elementary collaborates with local middle schools that fifth grade students transition into upon completing the fifth grade. Students visit the middle schools to participate in a tour and receive information about classes, after-school programs, and academic programs. Staff members from the middle schools meet with Port Salerno Elementary fifth grade teachers and coaching staff to discuss placement of students with individual educational plans. Using student data, fifth grade students are placed in appropriate middle school classes.

**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 structure of the data team meetings supports students by problem solving around specific needs. Teams will meet and share specific assessment data, instructional practices and make decisions about interventions and strategic grouping. Coaches will make sure that teachers are supported with any professional development needs, resources or support with the core.

Port Salerno Elementary school coordinates and integrates all federal, state, and local programs that impact the school:

- Implements research-based resources funded by federal and local funds.
- Title I Parent Resource Center located on our campus hosts our School Advisory Committee meetings, new teacher/mentor tours, community information trainings and parent visits.
- The Comprehensive Needs Assessment considers student academic needs as well as staff development data that addresses the priorities established for Title III, Migrant, and Title I programs.
- School Improvement Plan objectives reflect the research-based strategies with a focus on achieving state and district priorities.
- Input from the Pre-K programs is obtained by the school and district and is included in the transition plan.
- Partnerships are established.
- With coordination and scheduling of instructional programs.
- With implementation of parent information programs such as Parent Coffees, SAC Meetings, Lunch and Learn activities, Parent University Nights, and student/parent math, literacy, and science nights.
- Brochures and referrals for parent and student support from the guidance department, school nurse and other school and district personnel.

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

Port Salerno Elementary has established a partnership with the Boys and Girls Club. This partnership has helped develop the Americorp program within the school which serves as a push in support for struggling readers. The program is funded through a grant and has allowed for mentors and community members to be engaged in students' lives.

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading Proficiency Grades K-2				\$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5000		0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$5,000.00
<i>Notes: Teachers College Reading and Writing Project Summer Institute- 2 staff members</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading Proficiency Grades 3-5				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,000.00
<i>Notes: Art and PE Professional Development with a content focus on vocabulary and phonological awareness Nonfiction focused guided reading sets</i>						

<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency Grades K-2</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency Grades 3-5</b>				<b>\$2,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Afterschool club to empower girls in STEM/Math and Science</i>			
<b>5</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Nature of Science</b>				<b>\$1,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: SAC Funds approved for science lab resources, field trips, and science support.</i>			
<b>6</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Life Science</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$10,000.00</b>