

Pinellas County Schools

# Ozona Elementary School



## 2020-21 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>13</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>39</b>

# Ozona Elementary School

601 TAMPA RD, Palm Harbor, FL 34683

http://www.ozona-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

## Demographics

Principal: Lisa Freeman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	34%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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>13</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>39</b>

# Ozona Elementary School

601 TAMPA RD, Palm Harbor, FL 34683

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

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	26%
<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	17%

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

Create highest student achievement, in a safe environment, using effective learning systems to develop the whole child in collaboration with the community.

**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
Freeman, Lisa	Principal	Principal The duties include but are not limited to promoting and maintaining high student achievement by shaping a vision of academic success for all students, providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school operations, ensuring a safe learning environment, cultivating leadership in others and maintaining a school climate that is supportive to the needs of staff, students and families.
Downes, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader, curriculum and instruction manager, SIP goals, assists in monitoring data, school testing coordinator, teacher evaluations and walk throughs, discipline, Family engagement, Safety/Emergency Drills,Transportation, CST, PBIS
Repetosky, Nicola	School Counselor	See Something, Say Something coordinator, MTSS facilitator, bully investigator, 504 coordinator, gifted coordinator, STEPS coordinator Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Chambers, Kathleen	Other	Behavior Specialist: write and monitor PBIPs and FBAs, Assists AP with facilitation of PBIS/PBIS data/reports, RP trainer Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional/behavioral support and data monitoring.
Flood, Marissa	Teacher, PreK	PreK 4 year old ESE blended Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Light, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	KG Teacher Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Hering, Sheryl	Teacher, K-12	1st grade teacher Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Danneman, Carolyn	Teacher, K-12	2nd gr teacher Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hollenbeck, Bridgett	Teacher, K-12	4th gr teacher Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Teig, Jordie	Teacher, K-12	5th gr teacher Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Miller, Colleen	Teacher, ESE	Teacher of ASD 3rd-5th Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Magee, Margaret	Teacher, ESE	VE Resource teacher Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Keller, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Art teacher Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Willett, Edward	Other	Technology Technician (support staff) Ensures tech is available for students/staff, tech inventory, tech help tickets, tech repairs Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Rutkoski, Lyza	Teacher, K-12	3rd gr teacher Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Miller, Michael	Other	Support Early Childhood learning/staff developer Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Lisa Freeman

**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.*

3

**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.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

53

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	34%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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	82	128	133	109	123	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	1	19	14	15	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	3	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/6/2020

#### 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	111	125	104	126	109	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	704
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	5	10	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

**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	1	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	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	129	133	102	123	112	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	722
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	5	10	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

**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	1	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	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	69%	54%	57%	66%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	59%	58%	59%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	54%	53%	48%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	73%	61%	63%	70%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	61%	62%	64%	61%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	48%	51%	45%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	53%	53%	77%	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	71%	56%	15%	58%	13%
	2018	71%	53%	18%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	56%	13%	58%	11%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
	2018	64%	50%	14%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	62%	12%	62%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	70%	62%	8%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	64%	15%	64%	15%
	2018	71%	62%	9%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	68%	60%	8%	60%	8%
	2018	69%	61%	8%	61%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	53%	16%
	2018	72%	57%	15%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	34	50	46	48	60	55	50				
ELL	55			62	80						
HSP	66	71		57	60						
MUL	80			80							
WHT	69	69	57	75	70	55	71				
FRL	53	58	55	60	72	55	53				

  

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	28	40	36	33	44	40					
ELL	40			50							
HSP	47	32		57	53	40	50				
MUL	91			92							
WHT	63	46	42	72	66	47	76				
FRL	55	50	47	53	52	41	45				

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	28	38	27	30	71	64	33				
HSP	34	52	36	38	44	46	47				
MUL	73			90							
WHT	70	63	57	73	67	42	81				
FRL	46	57	53	53	62	47	62				

### 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	66
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	461
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	66
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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

<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%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	80
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<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%	0
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
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.**

Predicted 7 cell chart for 2020 based on AAR's Feb. performance estimate

ELA Math Science

P 70 74 72

LG 60 64

L25 52 53

Total: 445 A

This predicted data shows a decrease in the following areas:

ELA LG 69 to 60

Math LG 70 to 64

ELA L25 LG: 58 to 52

Proficiency was predicted to increase in ELA, Math, Science

Continue to struggle with learning gains/L25 LG

Predicted Subgroup proficiency data based on Winter MAP:

Math: B 66%, H 74.6%, W 83%

ELL 66%, GP 99%, SWD 59.6%

ELA: B: 66%, H 66%, W 71%

ELL: 33%, 96.5%, SWD 34%

ELA continues to be lower in P, LG & L25 than Math including Hispanic, White, ELL & SWD

ELA proficiency achievement gap between W & B is: 5%

Math proficiency achievement gap between W & B is: 17%

SWD: ELA & Math proficiency was predicted to be -15% (34% proficient) from last year's ELA FSA.

This would not meet ESSA goal

L25 ELA subgroup has the lowest predicted performance at 52%. Contributing factors are lack of continuing exposure to standards, lack of stamina for reading and writing, lack of continuing exposure to rigor of the standards. Another contributing factor is in the lack of understanding on how to teach students with foundational gaps in reading at the intermediate level.

Cohorts lose proficiency from 3rd to 5th (historically)

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

Our ELA LG show the greatest predicted decline. 69% to 60% (-9%)

Based on ELA Winter MAP 4th grade had the lowest predicted ELA FSA proficiency at 65%

The dynamics of the 4th grade cohort posed a challenge: including relationships, behavior and motivation.

The prior year school developed biweeklies were used for pre & post (A & B) with emphasis on reteaching standards mastered at below 70%. This year we utilized district assessments with less emphasis and what kids already know.

2019 data:

Science proficiency declined from 73% to 69% (-3)

White subgroup declined in Science from 76 to 71 (-5)

During pull out chorus time science was not being taught with fidelity as evidence during ISM/walk-throughs

Therapy pulls from science block

Not meeting the rigor of science standards across grade levels. For example labeling

plant parts diagram, growing bean sprouts evidenced KG-3rd.  
KG lack science vocabulary knowledge

**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 Winter MAP data and 2019 State FSA data:

ELA L25 would be close to state data

Math LG and L25 would be close to state data

Positive gaps exist for grade levels 3rd-5th in ELA, Math and Science when compared to the state.

4th grade ELA had the lowest positive gap when compared to the state (+7%)

Focus need to be on monitoring master of standards, especially for L35.

Need to ensure teaching and learning to the rigor of the standard.

PD focus was not on teacher understanding/shifts of the standards.

Majority of PD and PLCs were math focused due to new curriculum/adoption. However, this was not reflected in predicted in LG & L25 Math performance.

2019 data:

Positive gaps exist for grade levels 3rd-5th in ELA, Math and Science when compared to the state.

In ELA and Math a focus on was placed on standards based instruction, designing tasks aligned to the rigor of standard and releasing students to the task. Biweeklies were utilized 1st-5th to monitor EA & Math standards mastery. Ready FL Reading books were a resource for small group. Professional development was on shifts in the standards. 5th gr Science diagnostic data shared with 3rd & 4th and lessons developed for reteach. Administrative walk-through feedback focused on standards based instruction.

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

Based on 5th grade science mid-year diagnostic Science would have showed the most improvement from 69% to 72% (+3%)

After school science tutoring/gaming focused on standards was put in place for 4 weeks.

5th grade teachers analyzed beginning of the year science diagnostic, planned and taught based on the gaps in mastery of previous grade level standards. Also utilized teacher written assessments.

2019 data:

ELA Learning gains showed the most improvement from 47% to 69% (+22%).

In addition, L25 ELA increased from 44% to 58% (+14%) and Gifted Students scoring

Level 4 or 5 on ELA increased from 68.8% to 84.2% (+15.4%)

Professional Development was focused on standards based instruction, administrative monitoring and feedback was focused on standards. Students were exposed and accountable for reading grade level texts. Biweeklies/formative assessments were utilized to monitor student mastery of standards. Ready reading workbooks were utilized in small group instruction.

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

Current fifth graders level 1's: 13 ELA, 9 Math

3 incoming 4th graders failing course grades in math

5 incoming 4th graders with 2 or more EWS indicators

Number of retainees: KG 3, 1st 1, 3rd 1, 4th 2

Attendance: 1st gr 19 students below 90%

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

Percentages are predictions

1. ELA L25 learning gains (52%)
2. Math L25 learning gains (53%)
3. SWD ELA proficiency (34%)
4. ELA learning gains (60%)
5. ELA core (70%)

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**

**Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

Our current data indicates a gap in achievement between our black and nonblack students as evidenced by the 2019 FSA and 2019 Winter Map data. Winter MAP data indicates that 34% of our black students were not proficient in ELA and 34% were not proficient in math.

Our current data indicates a gap in achievement between our SWD and nonSWD students as evidenced by the 2019 FSA and 2019 Winter Map data. Winter MAP data indicates that 66% of our SWD students were not proficient in ELA and 40% were not proficient in math.

To close the achievement gap we will participate in equity-centered PD school-wide. The problem/gap is occurring because our black students and our SWD students are not demonstrating mastery of standards at the appropriate level of complexity. As a result of equity centered problem solving within an MTSS framework, we will develop an equity goal to build relational capacity, as well as provide professional development on the use of equitable practices to close the opportunity gap.

**Measurable  
Outcome:**

To address mindset shift for the adoption of equitable practice, we will participate in equity-centered PD school-wide. Our current data illustrates an opportunity gap between our black/non-black students and our SWD/non-SWD students. The issue may be positively impacted by strengthening culturally relevant practice through targeted, sustained professional development (to include equitable grading and continued PD on Restorative Practice). We will measure progress by recording the number of PD sessions and those who attend. We will also measure medium-term outcomes by examining changes in teacher practice using a CRT classroom walk-through tool and identify positive trends in the data with respect to observable CRT practices and the number of teachers using them. Long-term measures of student outcome will be seen in achievement data where the opportunity gap will decrease by 50% as evidenced by the 2021 FSA in ELA and Math.

**Person responsible  
for monitoring  
outcome:**

Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

To close the opportunity gap between black/non-black students and SWD/non-SWD students using equitable practices (equitable grading, culturally relevant teaching, restorative practices) we will provide PD around these concepts through the following outlets (whole school, MTSS, SBLT and grade level PLC's). We will utilize the CRT classroom walk-through tool to provide bi-weekly feedback to individual teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence based practices that are impacting the opportunity gap with the entire staff.

**Rationale for  
Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

These strategies and practices were identified with the Racial Equity Analysis Protocol in mind (REAP).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Utilize Equity Champions within the school to conduct survey with respect to current understanding of equity practices (to be completed by mid-Sept) and to revisit in Feb.
2. Share CRT walk-through tool through grade level PLC's to build a common understanding/ language prior to consistent implementation. Administration will monitor CRT with tool quarterly.

3. Have teachers conduct self-audit using the CRT rubric in Sept and Feb.
4. Develop year-long scope of PD (to include analysis of survey results) that will take place monthly to include equitable grading practices, the impact of CRT (theory and strategies) and district developed equity modules
5. MTSS will share data (EWS, iStation, Dreambox, MAP) monthly through data driven PLC

**Person Responsible** Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

## #2. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** In 2018-2019 Ozona Elementary achieved Healthy Schools Bronze status. Ozona Elementary staff and students can begin planning the action steps to reach Silver status for 2020-2021. The problem/gap is occurring because of lack of evidence of implementation for the last 3 modules. If modules are reviewed and we implement more opportunities for focusing on healthy food/movement, and plan events accordingly the problem would be reduced by meeting additional modules.

**Measurable Outcome:** The number of modules Ozona Elementary will receive recognition on will increase to meeting 6 out of 6 modules and become eligible for silver status as measured by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation online assessment tool by the end of the 2020-2021 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jessica Downes (downesj@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** An action plan to implement healthy activities/options for students and staff throughout the school year as well as a timeline will be created by the school based Healthy Schools Team to begin modules that will increase our status.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** By creating an action plan with clear steps Gold status can be reached within two years. According to the article Health and Academic Achievement from the CDC, "schools, health agencies, parents and communities share a common goal of supporting the link between healthy eating, physical activity, and improved academic achievement of children and adolescents."

### Action Steps to Implement

Reviewing the Policy and Environment module and working to meet the 5 total topics needed for Silver recognition.

**Person Responsible** Nicola Repetosky (repetoskyn@pcsb.org)

Reviewing and completing at least 8 total topics needed for the Nutrition Services module in order to meet Silver level recognition.

**Person Responsible** Nicola Repetosky (repetoskyn@pcsb.org)

Reviewing and completing 5 total topics needed for the Smart Snacks module in order to meet Silver recognition requirements.

**Person Responsible** Nicola Repetosky (repetoskyn@pcsb.org)

Reviewing and completing 7 total topics needed for the Smart Snacks module in order to meet the Silver level recognition.

**Person Responsible** Nicola Repetosky (repetoskyn@pcsb.org)

Reviewing and completing 5 total topics needed for the Physical Activity module working toward Silver recognition.

**Person Responsible** Nicola Repetosky (repetoskyn@pcsb.org)

Reviewing and completing 4 total topics needed for the Employee Wellness module working toward Silver recognition.

**Person Responsible** Nicola Repetosky (repetoskyn@pcsb.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>Our current level of performance is 69% proficient, as evidenced in Spring 2019 FSA ELA results.</p> <p>According to Winter MAP 2019: 69% would be proficient.</p> <p>We expect our performance level to be 75% proficient by Spring 2021 FSA ELA results.</p> <p>The problem/gap is occurring because students are not demonstrating mastery of Key Idea &amp; Detail standards and Integration of Knowledge and Ideas standards. The problem/gap is occurring because students are not demonstrating mastery of standards at the appropriate level of complexity. If effective planning of rigorous tasks and instructional delivery around these standards aligned level of complexity would occur, to include monitoring &amp; adjusting instruction, the problem would be reduced by 6%.</p> <p>Based on 2019 FSA data:</p> <p>Cohorts of students over time are not maintaining grade level proficiency.</p> <p>Key ideas and details standards range from 52% to 58% across 3rd to 5th grade.</p> <p>Integration of knowledge and ideas percent correct:</p> <p>3rd: 57%</p> <p>4th: 54%</p> <p>5th: 58%</p> <p>Text based writing percent correct:</p> <p>4th: 58%</p> <p>5th: 62%</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 69% to 75% (+6%) as measured by the 2021 FSA ELA. The percent of students in the lowest 25% will increase learning gains from 58% to 65% (+7%) as measured by the 2021 FSA ELA.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	<p>Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>The rationale is based on FSA ELA performance on Main Idea and Key Details and Integration of Knowledge and Ideas standards.</p> <p>Students need exposure to grade level text and text sets aligned to targeted standards-based tasks . They need to increase their stamina within these texts. Teachers need to plan to strategically, embed texts and intentionally ask overlapping questions, thereby modeling the kind of relationship experienced readers should have with a text--one that is active, rather than passive, one that engages the reader with the main idea and doesn't get overwhelmed with the minutiae.(Reading Reconsidered, A Practical Guide to Rigorous Literacy Instruction by Doug Lemov)</p>

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Utilize grade level texts or above grade level texts as well as pairing of texts during core while providing opportunities for reading, writing, speaking, listening.



2. Co plan/co facilitate PLC with ELA Champions focused on building understanding of the standards/rigor especially Main Idea & Key Details and Integration of Knowledge & Ideas
3. Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning
4. Monitor exposure to grade level texts during walk-throughs/observations (Administration) and provide feedback to support teacher growth
5. Use module formatives (every 3 weeks)
6. Increase teacher knowledge of state writing expectations.
7. Focus instruction on the controlling idea, synthesis of ideas, not formulated writing.
8. Monitor that Writing instruction occurs every day to build stamina (Administration)
9. Provide PD (district and site based support) with respect to Canvas to provide a blended learning experience for students.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>2019 FSA Math results. We expect our performance level to be 80% proficient by Spring 2021 FSA Math results.</p> <p>The problem/gap is occurring because students are not demonstrating mastery of Measurement, Data &amp; Geometry, Numbers &amp; Operations-Fractions and Numbers &amp; Operations in Base Ten. L 25 learning gains is 53% (compared to learning gains 70%)</p> <p>If we were to strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks, and ensure staff understanding of how teaching should move from conceptual to procedural to real world as a means to define rigor the problem would be reduced by 7%.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	The percent of all students achieving Math proficiency will will increase from 73% to 80% (+7%) as measured by the 2021 FSA Math. The percent of students in the lowest 25 percentile will increase from 53% to 60% (+7%)
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, Number Routines, and other standards-aligned resources. Support this work through curriculum meetings, PLCs, feedback, and/or the use of classroom video.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We have been successful with math instruction, however the use of this strategy will provide instruction to ensure differentiation, intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Mathematics Teacher Leaders are identified and participating in MTLI Cohort 3
2. MTLI will be supported by math coach: use data to support unit lesson planning
3. Teachers will collaborate and select tasks aligned to the rigor of the standards
4. Teachers utilize unit prerequisite checks, digital comprehension checks in Ready Math and/or lesson quizzes to monitor mastery of standards (bi weekly).
5. Teachers regularly assess formally and informally--MAP, Unit Assessments (6), digital comprehension check (6-8)-- then utilize data to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach.
6. Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth.
7. Provide PD (district and site based support) with respect to Canvas to provide a blended learning experience for students.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

Our current level of performance is 69% proficient as evidenced in Spring 2019 SSA results. This is 4% decrease from Spring 2018 SSA results. We expect our performance level to be 75% proficient in Spring 2021 SSA results.

Based on the data collected from the 2019/2020 5th grade mid-year diagnostic and the 5th grade cycle 2 common assessment, our school needs to increase proficiency in the following areas: rocks and minerals, weathering and erosion, plants, phases of the moon, weather, and the solar system.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

We can achieve this through cross grade level articulation where we will plan targeted standards based instruction in each grade level. We will also continue science game based ELP which can be done virtually through teams and will target science vocabulary and content related to the areas in need of improvement.

Targeted focus standards will include:  
 1st grade- SC.1.E.5.1, SC.1.E.6.1, SC.1.P.8.1, SC.1.L.14.2  
 2nd grade- SC.2.E.7.1, SC.2.E.7.3, SC.2.L.14.1, SC.2.L.16.1  
 3rd grade- SC.3.P.8.3, SC.3.P.9.1, SC.3.L.14.1, SC.3.L.15.2, SC.3.L.17.2  
 4th grade- SC.4.E.5.3, SC.4.E.6.1, SC.4.E.6.2, SC.4.E.6.4, SC.4.L.16.1  
 5th grade- SC.5.E.5.2, SC.5.E.5.3, SC.5.E.7.3, SC.5.E.7.6

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of fifth grade students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 69% to 75% (+6%) as measured by the 2021 SSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jessica Downes (downesj@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model (10% setting the purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) and include appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignment to the 1st – 5th grade standards.

Students must receive consistent, effective instruction that promotes student centered activities (lab), increase domain specific vocabulary. Walk-through indicate science being taught at the same level of rigor across grade levels.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** District diagnostic identifies Plants, Rocks, Weathering & Erosion and Light as low mastery standards.

Targeted focus standards will include:  
 1st grade- SC.1.E.5.1, SC.1.E.6.1, SC.1.P.8.1, SC.1.L.14.2  
 2nd grade- SC.2.E.7.1, SC.2.E.7.3, SC.2.L.14.1, SC.2.L.16.1  
 3rd grade- SC.3.P.8.3, SC.3.P.9.1, SC.3.L.14.1, SC.3.L.15.2, SC.3.L.17.2  
 4th grade- SC.4.E.5.3, SC.4.E.6.1, SC.4.E.6.2, SC.4.E.6.4, SC.4.L.16.1  
 5th grade- SC.5.E.5.2, SC.5.E.5.3, SC.5.E.7.3, SC.5.E.7.6

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Administer the 3rd & 4th grade Review Diagnostic Assessment, 5th grade team leader shares the results with 3rd & 4th grade for planning of

instruction.

2. Use Diagnostic Review to plan re-teach lessons
3. 60 Science Power Words incorporated into specialists' lessons
4. Lesson focus will be on "confirming the learning"--lessons will have checkpoints and critical questions to monitor mastery and adjust instruction as needed.
5. Administrators will monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth in the teaching to the depth of the grade level standards.
6. Administrators monitor higher order questions being utilized daily ( continuity guide)
7. Administrators monitor grade level standards by SLAGs, this will allow for differentiation by grade level
8. 4th and 5th grade take unit assessments and identify low proficiency standards and embed into 5th grade science review plan.
9. Provide PD (district and site based support) with respect to Canvas to provide a blended learning experience for students.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Downes (downesj@pcsb.org)

**#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Bridging the Gap (Black Student Achievement)  
 2019 data:  
 Our black students demonstrated a proficiency rate of 40% in ELA compared to 69% proficiency demonstrated by the White students as measured by 2019 FSA ELA.  
 Our black students demonstrated a proficiency rate of 40% in Math compared to 75% proficiency demonstrated by White students as measured by the 2019 FSA Math.  
 0 of the 2 black students met proficiency on 2019 SSA Science.

Predicted Subgroup proficiency data based on Winter MAP 2019:  
 Math: B 66%, H 74.6%, W 83%  
 ELL 66%, GP 99%, SWD 59.6%  
 ELA: B: 66%, H 66%, W 71%  
 ELL: 33%, 96.5%, SWD 34%  
 ELA proficiency achievement gap between W & B is: 5%  
 Math proficiency achievement gap between W & B is: 17%

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Utilize Equity Champions within the school to conduct survey with respect to current understanding of equity practices (to be completed by mid-Sept) and to revisit in Feb.
2. Share CRT walk-through tool through grade level PLC's to build a common understanding/ language prior to consistent implementation. Administration will monitor CRT with tool quarterly.
3. Have teachers conduct self-audit using the CRT rubric in Sept and Feb.
4. Develop year-long scope of PD (to include analysis of survey results) that will take place monthly to include equitable grading practices, the impact of CRT (theory and strategies) and district developed equity modules
5. MTSS will share data (EWS, iStation, Dreambox, MAP) monthly through data driven PLC

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#7. Other specifically relating to School Climate/Conditions for Learning**

Conditions for Learning  
 Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 101 referrals generated by 35 students.  
 KG: 13  
 1st: 3  
 2nd: 7  
 3rd: 30  
 4th: 30  
 5th: 18  
 Number of referrals/behavior students by subgroup:  
 Black: 12/1  
 Hispanic: 10/5  
 White: 78/28  
 Risk ratio:  
 Black: 2.4  
 Hispanic: 1.3  
 Compared to white: .87  
 14 SWD students generate 52% of the referrals (53/101 referrals). SWD Risk Ratio: 3.52  
 Males generate 87% of the referrals. Females generate 13%.  
 The problem/gap is occurring due to is a need for consistency across school of Tier 1 PBIS/Guidelines for Success and Restorative Practices. If PBIS & Restorative Practice structures are implemented school-wide, the problem would be reduced by creating classroom cultures that are responsive and inclusive of all learners academic and social needs as evidenced by a decrease in referral data and an increase in positive behavior recognition. We need to build capacity for implementation across all grades/units of ASD students, including cafe and specials.

**Measurable Outcome:** We expect our number of referrals to decrease by 20% in all areas by the end of the 2020-2021 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kathleen Chambers (chamberska@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students and create strong classroom communities. Strengthen the implementation of research-based best practices that communicate high expectations for each student. Support the development and/or implementation of school-wide ownership of equitable practices that engage students in acknowledging and adhering to processes and procedures.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** By establishing and maintaining positive relationships with all students, students will be more engaged and connected to their classroom environment which will decrease the opportunity for off-task and disruptive behavior. With a focus on Restorative Practices students will receive fresh starts, equitable discipline and opportunity to communicate their needs to a classroom teacher or other trusted adult on campus. An increased focus on equitable practices will proliferate an emotionally, intellectually and physically safe environment for all students.

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure all teaching staff and support receive RP training and ongoing PD
2. Strengthen the implementation of Restorative Practices in all classrooms and less structured areas of the school (cafe, hallway, recess)
3. Ensure the school-wide discipline plan and classroom discipline plans include restorative language, questioning, etc.
4. Support the implementation engagement strategies that support the development of social and instructional teaching practices
5. Professional Development for instructional & support staff with a focus on deescalation of student behavior and appropriate positive interventions
6. Monitor all staff for implementation with fidelity and provide actionable feedback
7. School-wide PBIS (review during pre-school facilitated by AP)
8. Positive behavior referral system with increased use from prior year (Ozzie tickets)
7. School-wide celebrations monthly (effort, citizenship, school wide expectations)
9. Develop a clear discipline/referral process for both teachers and students utilize the staff Behavior Handbook
10. Within SBLT, analyze and review data quarterly to identify progress, areas for improvement, trends and next steps.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

**#8. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The '19-'20 attendance rate for all students is 95.2%. With 13% of students missing 10% or more.  
 5% of our students are absent 20% or more  
 Black: 0% (absent 20% or more) 10% (absent 10% or more)  
 Hispanic: 9% (absent 20% or more) 19% (absent 10% or more)  
 White: 4% (absent 20% or more) 13% (absent 10% or more)  
 The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because of lack of parent understanding and/or placing a higher priority on consistent attendance for their child. If more consistent parent education opportunities would occur, the problem would be reduced by 50%. At the time of this writing, we are in a current pandemic with parents making choice about face to-face vs virtual instruction for the start of the 2020-2021 SY. Our area of focus will continue, however the lens in which we are looking may vary depending on the specific student situation

**Measurable Outcome:**

We will decrease our number of students absent 10% or more from 13% to 5% (-8%)  
 5% of our students are absent 20% or more.  
 Students absent 20% or more will decrease from 5% to 0%, unless an emergency medical situation occurs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jessica Downes (downesj@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all Tiers and through each instructional delivery model (face-to-face/virtual) on an on-going basis.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

If we establish an understanding for parents on how student absences are tied to academic success we will see a decrease in the number of students missing 10% or more of school.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes
2. Implement Tier 2 and 3 plans for student specific needs and review barriers and effectiveness on a bi-weekly basis
3. Engage students and families in attendance related activities to ensure



they are knowledgeable of the data and aware of the importance of attendance (newsletters, messenger calls, website)

4. Review protocol for follow up with families for face-to-face and virtual when consistent student

absences are occurring

5. Develop and implement attendance incentive programs for students and staff

6. Ensure that monitoring of attendance and corresponding incentives are reflective of a blended learning model that incorporates both face to face and virtual learning.

**Person Responsible**

Jessica Downes (downesj@pcsb.org)

**#9. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Over the past several years we have seen a decline in the number of volunteers and support for school events. This decline is due to an increase in the number of working parents in the home, other care givers having responsibility for the student and lack of time or understanding of ways to partner in their child's education. With the current pandemic we will need to redefine how our families and communities can stay connected while maintaining the safety of students and staff.

**Measurable Outcome:**

With an increased focus on recruitment of volunteers, and parent education on ways to partner in their child's education we will see an increase in student achievement and continue to strengthen our school community.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Moncrieff (moncrieffj@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Effectively communicate with families about their students' progress and school processes/practices and purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to partner with us for the success of their students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

By educating families on school processes/practices and sharing information regarding student progress we expect to see an increase in family and community engagement through volunteer opportunities as well as opportunities for families (no matter their schedule) to partner in their child's education. We will be cognizant of the current limitations due the pandemic and provide alternate ways for families to stay connected.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Streamline family engagement efforts that are result-oriented (linked to learning), by confirming families practice new tips or tools, learn new tips to support their child at home, share knowledge with the teacher
2. Provide academic workshops for parents to increase support at home to include virtual learning platforms such as Teams and Canvas
3. Utilize social media to increase communication with parents

**Person Responsible**

Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

**#10. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
 ESE ELA and Math  
 Rationale  
 Our current level of performance for SWD is 34% proficient as evidenced in Spring 2019 FSA ELA.  
 Our current level of performance for SWD is 48% proficient as evidenced in Spring 2019 FSA Math.  
 The problem/ gap is occurring because students lack foundational skills and stamina for grade level rigorous tasks. Testing/assessments rely heavily on reading comprehension. Specifically designed instruction and differentiated instruction for ESE students is lacking.  
 SWD ELA proficiency up from 28% to 34%(+6), LG from 40% to 50% (+10), L25 up from 36% to 46% (+10%)  
 SWD Math proficiency up from 33% to 48% (+15%), LG up from 44% to 60% (+16), L25 up from 40% to 55% (+11)

**Measurable Outcome:**  
 The percent of SWD students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 34% to 40% (+6%) as measured by the 2021 FSA ELA.  
 The percent of SWD students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 48% to 55% (+7%) as measured by the 2021 FSA Math.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**  
 Margaret Magee (mageem@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Students requiring ESE services work toward mastery of Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous grade level content in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Research strategies according to Vahughn, Bos and Schumm 2007, Marzano, et. al., 2001: Tomlison and McTighte 2006, suggest various ways to increase learning for ESE students by: using a combination of direct instruction and cognitive strategy instruction, teach in small interactive groups, extend practice and application of skills/concepts, use "think" aloud techniques, and present learning in multiple ways.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Administrators and ESE teachers will will implement a process for placing students requiring ESE services in master schedules first in order to optimize service delivery.
2. ESE and classroom teachers will ensure ESE students have access to grade level texts, rigorous tasks, materials and content.
3. ESE and classroom teachers will use evidence-based practices for students with disabilities to teach foundational literacy and math skills as as a pathway to grade level work on an on-going basis
4. Quarterly VE Resource teachers will observe students within the classroom and provide feedback to classroom teacher on practices to increase engagement and rigor of ESE students.
5. Ensure digital learners receive ESE services and strong core

**Person Responsible**

Margaret Magee (mageem@pcsb.org)

**#11. Other specifically relating to Gifted**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>Our current Gifted students of performance is 84.2% level 4 or level 5 as evidenced by Spring 2019 FSA ELA.</p> <p>Our current Gifted students level of performance is 89.5% level 4 or level 5 as evidenced by Spring 2020 FSA Math.</p> <p>This is above the state and district average for ELA &amp; Math. However our gifted population is decreasing due to the opening/expansion of a local gifted center.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>The percent of Gifted students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 84% to 90% (+6%) level 4 or level 5 as measured by the 2021 FSA ELA.</p> <p>The percent of Gifted students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 89.5% to 95% level 4 or level 5 as measured by the 2021 FSA Math.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. Including the clustering of gifted students and an increase in staff becoming micro-credentialed.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Research supports cluster grouping when students are paired with gifted knowledgeable teachers, and differentiation has been shown to better meet the needs of gifted learners and provide opportunities for growth.</p> <p>(The Cluster Grouping handbook: How to Challenge Gifted Students and Improve Achievement for All, Winebrenner &amp; Brulles)</p>

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Intentional cluster grouping of gifted learners in grades 3, 4 & 5
2. Teachers engaging in gifted micro-credential and/or gifted endorsement
3. Planned Intentional differentiation for gifted learners is reflected in lessons, monitored with Administrators' feedback
4. PD for differentiation for gifted learners
5. Administrators participated in Leading Differentiation: Growing Teachers Who Grow Kids
6. Administrators recommend that Deliberate Practice Plan incorporate opportunities for growth in the area of differentiating for gifted learners

**Person Responsible** Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

### **Gifted Students**

**Our current Gifted students level of performance is 84.2% level 4 or level 5 as evidenced by Spring 2019 FSA ELA.**

**Our current Gifted students level of performance is 89.5% level 4 or level 5 as evidenced by Spring 2020 FSA Math.**

**This is above the state and district average for ELA & Math. However our gifted population is decreasing due to the opening/expansion of a local gifted center.**

## **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.

A positive classroom and school culture is of utmost importance at Ozona Elementary School. Our Administration Team makes themselves visible and accessible to all staff, students, families and stakeholders to ensure that the school culture is reflective of our mission and vision.

An annual school climate survey is presented to all staff, students and families. The results and feedback is then shared with staff at faculty meetings and with families and stakeholders during monthly SAC and PTA meetings. The feedback helps the Administration Team adjust and continue to make improvements to continue our positive school climate.

We have a growing VPK center which reaches out to surrounding Early Childhood providers, learning about incoming students and the curriculum they have been exposed to. Our VPK team collaborates with Early Childhood centers and families to ensure a fluid transition for our Little Ospreys. Once ready to move to our main building at the end of the year, our VPK team works closely with our Kindergarten team to continue the fluid transition to our main campus readying the students for Kindergarten standards and daily processes.

Ozona Elementary School welcomes families and students with a variety of activities throughout the year sponsored by our partnership with our PTA. Families enjoy events such as Fall Festival, Jingle Jog and Student Showcase. Ozona Elementary values the partnerships with families and stakeholders and knows that Volunteers are a valuable way to help our students progress even further. We hold Volunteer Orientations and celebrate our Volunteers through an End of Year Volunteer luncheon. Ozona has a strong partnership with St. Pete college and open our doors to level 3 interns. We use our positive school climate to help train and teach all those in their teaching program. Our teachers provide positive and constructive feedback to St. Pete college advisors which helps grow future teachers for Pinellas County.

Our school shares our positive culture guidelines with all families at Open House at the beginning of each year. To ensure our school climate continues to progress throughout the year, students, families and

stakeholders review the School Guidelines for Success with Administration at each of the monthly award celebrations where students are recognized for Osprey Effort as well as Citizen of the month recognition. Ongoing communication from the Administration team is also evident through monthly newsletters, Social Media platforms, our school website as well as School Messenger. Ozona Elementary School values all partnerships (staff, students, families and stakeholders) and knows it takes a village to help our Ospreys soar to success.

**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.	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Equity &amp; Diversity</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
2	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
3	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>				<b>\$1,720.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		120-Classroom Teachers	3071 - Ozona Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,720.00
<i>Notes: TDEs for teacher planning &amp; data analysis</i>						
4	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>				<b>\$1,720.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		120-Classroom Teachers	3071 - Ozona Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,720.00
<i>Notes: Teacher planning and data analysis</i>						
5	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
6	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
7	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Other: School Climate/Conditions for Learning</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
8	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Student Attendance</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
9	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Parent Involvement</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
10	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
11	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Other: Gifted</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$3,440.00</b>