

Pinellas County Schools

Curtis Fundamental Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Curtis Fundamental Elementary

531 BELTREES ST, Dunedin, FL 34698

<http://www.curtis-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Richard Knight

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (82%)
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 Pinellas 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Curtis Fundamental Elementary

531 BELTREES ST, Dunedin, FL 34698

<http://www.curtis-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>15%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>26%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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.

The staff of Curtis Fundamental Elementary will partner with students, parents, and the community to create and maintain a quality and safe learning environment enabling each student to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Knight, Richard	Principal	Principal
Johnson, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Teacher, Grade 3 Equity Champion
Jolliffe, Heidi	School Counselor	School Counselor
Wood, Sari	SAC Member	Parent
Brown, Carrie	Teacher, K-12	Teacher Gifted
DeWese, Maria	Instructional Coach	Curriculum Specialist
Manley, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Teacher PE
McElveen, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Teacher Grade 5
Tuttle, Robert	Teacher, K-12	Teacher Grade 2

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/8/2020, Richard Knight

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (82%)
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 .	

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	90	90	90	90	88	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	536
Attendance below 90 percent	0	5	2	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 6/13/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	82%	54%	57%	83%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	81%	59%	58%	75%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	79%	54%	53%	65%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	86%	61%	63%	90%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	78%	61%	62%	87%	61%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	48%	51%	84%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	78%	53%	53%	78%	53%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	56%	22%	58%	20%
	2018	83%	53%	30%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	56%	28%	58%	26%
	2018	69%	51%	18%	56%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	84%	54%	30%	56%	28%
	2018	76%	50%	26%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	62%	20%	62%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	94%	62%	32%	62%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	64%	26%	64%	26%
	2018	88%	62%	26%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	88%	60%	28%	60%	28%
	2018	88%	61%	27%	61%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	76%	54%	22%	53%	23%
	2018	82%	57%	25%	55%	27%
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	53	80	70	58	40	36					
BLK	50			90							
HSP	74	90		78	60						
MUL	79			100							
WHT	84	80	79	86	77	64	79				
FRL	65	86		76	82		69				

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	35			52	27						
BLK	53	33		67	58						
HSP	67			80							
MUL	85			100							
WHT	79	56	50	91	71	58	87				
FRL	63	44	35	76	61	50	65				

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	53			60							
BLK	47	36		67	73	70					
HSP	71	75		86	88		50				
MUL	60	67		87	75						
WHT	88	80	77	92	89	91	88				
FRL	65	57	38	73	77	73	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	79
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	551
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	56
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	76
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	90
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	78
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	76
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Based on the 2018-2019 FSA Testing Results:
Fifth Grade Math L25 Learning Gains (57%). Weak foundational skills displayed by the students identified as L25 in Math. Weak foundational reading skills (comprehension) for students identified as L25 in Math. Based on the 2018-2019 data, our L25 students scored lowest in the category of Measurement, Data and Geometry. Trend data shows that students who scored a level 1 (9 students) on the 2017-2018 FSA ELA, 4 of those students scored a level 1 (2 students) or 2 (2 students) on the 2018-2019 FSA Math.

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

Based on the 2018-2019 FSA Testing Results:
The greatest decline was in FSA Mathematics. As a school we went from 90% in 2017-2018 to 86% in 2018-2019.

By grade level Trend by grades

2018 2019 2018 2019

3rd 94 82 3rd to 4th 94 90

4th 88 90 4th to 5th 88 88

5th 88 88

Contributing factors include low scores in the area of Measurement, Data and Geometry. Teachers report weak vocabulary development and knowledge in the area of Measurement, Data and Geometry.

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.

Based on the 2018-2019 FSA Testing Results:
The 2018-2019 data shows a positive gap from the state in the areas of ELA and Science (25 points). In ELA, an intense focus on differentiation during class as well as many before and after school programs focusing on L25 students and struggling students through the use of iReady and grade level standards. In science, student data was disaggregated from the 5th grade diagnostic assessments and students groups were formed after school to focus on 3rd and 4th grade standards as well as science vocabulary that were needed.

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

Based on the 2018-2019 FSA Testing Results:
The area of most improvement from the 2017-2018 school year to the 2018-2019 school year is in the number of L25 students making Learning Gains in ELA. The data improved from 43% in 2018 to 79% in 2019. An intense focus on differentiation during class as well as many before and after school programs focusing on L25 students and struggling students through the use of iReady and grade level standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Based on data from the 2018-2019 school year our area of concern is absences. Last year we had 3% (17 students) absent 10% or more.

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

1. Increase the number of students scoring Level 3 and above on the 2020-2021 ELA FSA to from 82% to 88%.
2. Increase the number of students scoring Level 3 and above on the 2020-2021 Math FSA from 86% to 90%.
3. Increase the number of students scoring a level 3 and above on the 2020-2021 Science Assessment from 76% to 82%.
4. Increase the number of students identified as gifted scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2020-2021 FSA ELA Assessment.
5. Increase the number of black students scoring a level 3 and above on the 2020-2021 FSA ELA from 50% to 80%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	On the 2018-2019 ELA FSA, 82% of our students scored a level 3. Based on 2019-2020 Winter MAP projections, 78% of our 3rd grade students and 89% of our 4th grade students were projected to be a level 3 and above on the 2019-2020 FSA ELA.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the number of students scoring Level 3 and above on the 2020-2021 ELA FSA to from 82% to 88%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback. The most important component of the literacy block is ensuring ample time is given to students to read and write appropriate, grade level text and apply foundational skills, with high quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Increasing students opportunities to write will improve their reading comprehension. This strategy focuses on providing time for students to read and write text based responses based on grade level text. District and teacher assessments will be used to monitor student progress.

Action Steps to Implement

1. During staff meeting, conduct cross grade level articulation to analyze student work in order to develop understanding the progression of ELA Standards.
2. Use of DBQ's in grades 3, 4 and 5.
3. 3rd, 4th and 5th grade will attend after-school training on ELA instruction.
4. Provide half-day TDE for K-5th grade to plan for whole group and differentiated instruction (with a focus on students with learning gaps).
5. 3rd and 5th grade teachers will be participating in the Javits Differentiation Program.
6. All grade levels will have a VE Cluster class so that our VE teacher can push in to classrooms to provide support.

Person Responsible Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: On the 2018-2019 ELA Math Assessment, 86% of our students scored a level 3. Based on 2019-2020 Winter MAP projections, 30 students were projected to drop a level on the 2019-2020 FSA Math Assessment.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the number of students scoring Level 3 and above on the 2020-2021 Math FSA from 86% to 90%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Ensure that rigorous, student centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready classroom mathematics, Dreambox Learning, and Number Routines. Support this work through curriculum meetings, PLC's, and feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: With consideration of the new mathematics adoption (which was not fully implemented last year), rigorous instruction will occur alongside focused support of the new math series.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Half day TDE twice this year for grades K-5 for planning of new math adoption.
2. Delegating specific time during weekly PLC's to discuss and plan for mathematics instruction using pre-requisite checks, lesson quizzes and digital completion checks.
3. At Open House- parents will be given information on the new math adoption in their respective grade levels.
4. Staff will attend trainings at school and/or after school hours focusing on Dreambox and/or Number Routines and share at Weekly PLC's.
5. Math Data will be analyzed at monthly data chats with an emphasis on MAP data and in class observations and other formative assessments.
6. 3rd and 5th grade teachers will be participating in the Javits Differentiation Program.
7. All grade levels will have a VE Cluster class so that our VE teacher can push in to classrooms to provide support.

Person Responsible Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The percentage of 5th grade students scoring Level 3 and above decreased from 82% for the 2017-2018 school year to 76% for the 2018-2019 school year.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the number of students scoring a level 3 and above on the 2020-2021 Science Assessment from 76% to 82%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement and monitor science academic gaming based on data, with a priority focus on the 60 power words and other related vocabulary based on grade level standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Science assessment relies heavily on reading comprehension and vocabulary knowledge with an emphasis on domain specific vocabulary.

Action Steps to Implement

1. K-5 science vocabulary articulation on-site training.
2. Continue a science vocabulary journal that follow students from 3rd-5th grade based on state science domain words.
3. Expose all students (K-5) to science vocabulary by having science vocabulary words on morning news.
4. Use academic gaming to introduce and support science vocabulary development.
5. Science Vocabulary will be made available to all families based on their grade level at the beginning of the school year.
6. 5th grade teachers will use the Science Diagnostic to identify 3rd and 4th grade standards that students need additional support in mastering.
7. 5th grade diagnostic scores will be used to create Science Club ELP for students who need support in 3rd and 4th grade standards.

Person Responsible Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 43% of our African American students scored below a level 3 on the 2018-2019 FSA ELA assessment.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the number of black students scoring a level 3 and above on the 2020-2021 FSA ELA from 43% to 80%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Ensure instructional supports are in place for African-American students are equitable and culturally relevant during core instruction and independent learning. These supports include access to grade level text and beyond as well as small group instruction for African-American students who score Level 1 or 2 on the ELA FSA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: On the 2018-2019 ELA FSA, our African American students (57%) scored below the average percentage of non-African American students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue Training and implementation of Restorative Practices in all classrooms.
2. Book study- Why Are All The Black Kids Sitting Together In The Cafeteria? facilitated by the principal.
3. Equity with excellence training for staff (pre-school and ongoing) facilitated by Equity Champions.
4. School Based Mentor Program
5. Revisit classroom libraries to provide diverse literature with diverse authors and diverse subjects.
6. Monitor through use of Avid Reflection Survey for staff.

Person Responsible: Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	3% (17 students) of our student population is missing 10% or more for the 2019-2020 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of students missing 10% or more from 17 students to 10 students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	CST Team will monitor absences at biweekly meetings.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase awareness of attendance and monitoring of students absences.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review CST data from last school year at first CST Meeting.
2. Review EWS data for absences at first CST Meeting.
3. Review attendance responsibilities with teachers.
4. Promote positive attendance and ties to academic performance on morning news.

Person Responsible Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Community Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Partnerships with families and the community are an integral part of creating a positive school climate and assuring high academic achievement for students.

Measurable Outcome: Meet requirements for attainment of The 5 Star Award.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Ensure parents and community partners are aware of a variety of opportunities for involvement before, during and after school to support student success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Increase the number of volunteer hours and build and retain business partnerships. (When appropriate)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Training for families on logging volunteer hours. (When appropriate)
2. Contact local businesses to partner with the school to provide volunteers and possible funding.
3. Hold volunteer breakfast/orientation at the beginning of the school year. (When appropriate)
4. Set up a pick up point for volunteer activities. (When appropriate)
5. Approach family engagement efforts as a key strategy use to improve student achievement and student learning.
6. Importance of having an active family engagement school team, and a parent on your SBLT.
7. Data should drive your virtual webinars/training
8. Virtual libraries that include live webinars
 - a. Professional Training for Instructional staff
 - b. Parent Training/Webinars – Raising the Bar
 - c. Equity and Family Engagement
 - d. Resources/Tools
 - e. Accountability/Assessment Tools/Measurable goals
 - f. Parent Information & Advocacy
9. Enhance toolkits and supports so all schools implement, communicate and monitor family engagement strategies that are connected to learning and academic achievement of students.

Person Responsible Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#7. Other specifically relating to Equity**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: 53% of our ESE students scored a level 3 and above on the 2018-2019 FSA ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase the number of ESE students scoring a level 3 or above on the 2020-2021 FSA ELA from 53% on the 2018-2019 FSA ELA to 60% scoring a level 3 and above on the 2020-2021 FSA ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Book Study for additional staff members "Rigor for Students With Special Needs" by Barbara R. Blackburn and Bradley S. Witzel facilitated by principal.
Clustering of VE students in grades K-5 to allow for a push in model of our students identified as Varied Exceptionalities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This book study will allow staff to develop strategies to work with ESE students.
Clustering of students will allow the VE teacher to provide more time for students as well as eliminate loss of instructional time due to transitions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Equity training for all staff during pre-school presented by the equity champions at our school.
2. Have more staff earn their Equity Champion distinction.
3. Conduct focused book study for staff members facilitated by principal.
4. Create master schedule that allows for clustering of students that are identified with varied exceptionalities.
5. Restorative Practices training conducted by our Restorative Practices Champion.
6. Monitor through use of Avid Reflection Survey for staff.

Person Responsible

Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#8. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Increase healthy habits of all students.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of all students participating in activities to increase healthy habits will increase from 70% to 85%, as measured by the Healthy Schools Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Educators realize that a child's physical, emotional, social and mental health directly affects behaviors and learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional Development for the staff in the areas of cafeteria, classroom, before school, after school and PTA related activities.
2. Implementation of Go Noodle, School Garden, Workout Wednesdays, Morning Running Club, Fitness Jar for students, staff and parents, when appropriate.
3. Staff will participate in Mental Health Training.

Person Responsible Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#9. Other specifically relating to Gifted Students

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

72% of 3rd grade students (now 5th grade students), identified as gifted, from the 2018-2019 FSA scored a level 4 or 5 on the FSA Math Assessment.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the number of 5th grade students identified as gifted scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2020-2021 FSA Math Assessment from 72% to 90%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of Javits Differentiation for identified teachers in grades 3 and 5 clustering the gifted students in those grades.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Javits Differentiation will provide book studies, coaching and professional development for the Javits teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Book Study for all Javits Teachers.
2. Coaching for Javits Teachers provided by the gifted department.
3. Professional Development for Javits Teachers provided by the gifted department.

Person Responsible Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#10. Other specifically relating to Conditions for Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The number of behavior infractions issued from the classroom teachers was 341 for the 2018-2019 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce the number of behavior infractions issued from the classroom teachers for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Restorative Practices, Equity with Excellence, SEL, review of flow chart and Infraction Notification Form for ESE and 504 students. Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strengthen the implementation of research-based practices that communicate high expectations for each student. Support the implementation engagement strategies that support the development of social and instructional teaching practices.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Pre-School Training on Equity with Excellence conducted by our Equity Champions.
2. Pre-School Training on Restorative Practices conducted by our Restorative Practices Champion.
3. Review forms to staff during Pre-School facilitated by the principal.
4. Have teachers look at Equitable Practices during PLC's.
4. Monitor and support staff for implementation and fidelity through walk-throughs and conversations with staff.

Person Responsible Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

All areas have been addressed on the planning for improvement portion.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The foundation of the fundamental program includes strong relationships between school and home, and high expectations

Learning conditions that meet the needs of all students:

- Differentiated instruction in the classroom
- Tier 1, 2, and 3 interventions
- ESE providing modified instruction and accommodations
- 504 providing accommodations
- Gifted services

Student support from School Counselor, School Psychologist, Social Worker

Involvement of Parents as Stakeholders:

- 3 required parent conferences each year
- Required monthly PTA meetings (When appropriate)
- Volunteer opportunities (When appropriate)
- Participation in PTA, SAC, IAC (When appropriate)
- Surveys

Involvement of Community Members as Stakeholders:

- Community Business Partnership Program
- Participation in SAC
- Referrals to community agencies

Building a Positive School Culture and Environment with All Stakeholders:

- PBIS - with a focus on the lunchroom
- PAWS positive cafeteria program
- Monthly Open Court - families/community members invited (When appropriate)
- Friday lunches with families (When appropriate)
- Student Recognition - Open Court/CFN
 - o academic/behavior successes
 - o school/community achievements
- Positively Charged Kid (When appropriate)
- Terrific Kid
- Community Business Partners recognized on school marquee
- Great American Teach-In (When appropriate)
- Progressive Fundamental Discipline Plan
- School-wide Events (When appropriate)
 - o Field Day
 - o Variety Show
 - o 5th Grade Graduation
 - o Family Fun Night

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$2,100.00
---	--------	---	------------

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		140-Substitute Teachers	3131 - Curtis Fundamental Elementary	School Improvement Funds		\$2,100.00
			<i>Notes: Provide half-day TDE for K-5 teachers to plan for ELA instruction.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$580.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		140-Substitute Teachers	3131 - Curtis Fundamental Elementary	School Improvement Funds		\$580.00
			<i>Notes: Provide half-day TDE's for grades K-5 for planning of mathematics instruction.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American				\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Community Involvement				\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Equity				\$0.00
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools				\$0.00
9	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Gifted Students				\$0.00
10	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Conditions for Learning				\$0.00
					Total:	\$2,680.00