

Pinellas County Schools

Starkey Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	28

Starkey Elementary School

9300 86TH AVE, Seminole, FL 33777

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

Demographics

Principal: Audrey Chaffin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	28

Starkey Elementary School

9300 86TH AVE, Seminole, FL 33777

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	72%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

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

100% student success of achieving individual goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will partner with families to inspire a love for learning as students achieve personal goals.

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
Chaffin, Audrey	Principal	The Principal performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, safety, budget, purchasing, public relations, plant operations, food service, and transportation. Position is responsible for the total operational management of the school.
Harris, Tameka	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal performs administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, safety and transportation. Position is responsible for meeting with parents to discuss student behaviors and evaluate learning materials and data to determine areas where improvement is needed.
Burke, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	The ELA SIP goal co-manager is responsible for collaboratively drafting the SIP plan, implementing action steps in PLCs, analyzing and monitoring school wide data, and providing input to modifications needed based on analysis of school wide data.
Hall, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	As the Climate and Attendance SIP goal co-manager, she is responsible for collaboratively drafting the SIP plan, analyzing and monitoring school wide data, coordinating interventions and providing input to modifications needed based on analysis of school wide data while ensuring the MTSS process is implemented as needed.
Grasso, Kaitlyn	Teacher, K-12	The Family Involvement SIP goal co-manager is responsible for collaboratively drafting the SIP plan, implementing action steps in PLCs, analyzing and monitoring school wide data, and providing input to modifications needed based on analysis of school wide data. Mrs. Grasso also oversees our Title One compliance requirements.
Ridge, Mary	Teacher, K-12	As the Bridging the Gap SIP goal co-manager, she is responsible for collaboratively drafting the SIP plan, implementing action steps in PLCs, analyzing and monitoring school wide data, and providing input to modifications needed based on analysis of school wide data. Ms. Ridge also helps coordinate professional development needs based on SIP and school wide data.
Loubet, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	The AVID SIP goal co-manager is responsible for collaboratively drafting the SIP plan, implementing action steps in PLCs, analyzing and monitoring school wide data, and providing input to modifications needed based on analysis of school wide data.
Austin, Erica	Teacher, K-12	The Math SIP Goal Manager is responsible for collaboratively drafting the SIP plan, implementing action steps in PLCs, analyzing and monitoring school wide data, and providing input to modifications needed based on analysis of school wide data.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bedinghaus, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	The Healthy Schools co-manager responsibilities include focusing on physical activity, social-emotional health and healthy eating within our SIP goal. Responsibilities also include ensuring surveys, training, and monitoring tools are provided to support the Healthier Generation Alliance program.
Bailey, Debora	Teacher, K-12	The Science SIP Goal Manager is responsible for collaboratively drafting the SIP plan, implementing action steps in PLCs, analyzing and monitoring school wide data, and providing input to modifications needed based on analysis of school wide data.
Johnson, Alexan	School Counselor	As the Climate and Attendance SIP goal co-manager, she is responsible for collaboratively drafting the SIP plan, analyzing and monitoring school wide data, coordinating interventions and providing input to modifications needed based on analysis of school wide data while ensuring the MTSS process is implemented as needed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Audrey Chaffin

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.*

0

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

46

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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	73	110	93	100	98	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	569
Attendance below 90 percent	1	19	20	15	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	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	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	84	85	97	108	101	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	576
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	7	9	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
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	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	19	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	84	85	97	108	101	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	576
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	7	9	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
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	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	19	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	61%	54%	57%	63%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	59%	58%	57%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	54%	53%	56%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	61%	63%	77%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	61%	62%	69%	61%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	48%	51%	52%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	53%	53%	66%	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	47%	53%	-6%	57%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	56%	-2%	58%	-4%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
	2018	59%	50%	9%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	62%	7%	62%	7%
	2018	64%	62%	2%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	64%	11%	64%	11%
	2018	69%	62%	7%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	63%	60%	3%	60%	3%
	2018	81%	61%	20%	61%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	65%	54%	11%	53%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	68%	57%	11%	55%	13%
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	61	54		61	58	60	42				
ELL	53	67		50	47						
ASN	75	50		92	70						
BLK	35	38		39	69						
HSP	52	41		65	59		83				
MUL	71	60		71	70						
WHT	64	55	46	76	72	59	71				
FRL	50	50	42	61	63	55	60				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	58	69		67	69						
ELL	35			53							
ASN	69	67		81	75						
BLK	40			53							
HSP	57	53		70	61		67				
MUL	71			71							
WHT	57	57	41	74	64	61	70				
FRL	51	51	41	66	62	50	59				
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	37	47		77	76						
ELL	70			70							
ASN	81	90		94	90						
BLK	39	70		44	40						
HSP	69	63		82	81		67				
WHT	63	53	53	78	68	53	69				
FRL	53	56	68	71	65	52	57				

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	65
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	93
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	519
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	62
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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
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	60

Hispanic Students	
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	68
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	63
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	54
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.

ELA Proficiency in 4th and 5th grade showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors include changes in staff within the school year, changes in curriculum, lack of understanding of the standards. We also had a loss of instructional time and technology due to construction and classroom movements throughout first semester.

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

Fifth grade math proficiency had the greatest decline when compared to the prior year. Contributing factors include loss of instructional time and technology due to construction and classroom movements.

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.

ELA Proficiency in 4th and 5th grade had the greatest gap of -4% when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include changes in staff within the school year, changes in curriculum, lack of understanding of the standards, as well as loss of instructional time and technology due to construction and classroom movements.

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

Third grade ELA showed the most improvement. New actions taken were stronger collaboration among a new team with strengthened team planning and classroom routines. Also, a deeper understanding of MAP data led to stronger discussions for differentiated instruction.

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

Decreasing the percentage of students who are absent 10% or more of school will lead to higher student achievement.

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

1. Standards-based curriculum
2. Culturally relevant teaching
3. Differentiated instruction driven by formative assessments
4. Classroom management and routines
5. Family involvement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 57% of the students in grades 1-5 scored at the proficiency level on the 2019 ELA Winter MAP. Of those grade levels, grade 1 had the lowest scores. 43% of grade 1 students scored at the proficiency level compared to 60% of grades 2-5 students scoring at the proficiency level. 14% of grade 1 Black students scored at the proficiency level compared to 40% of grades 2-5 Black students scoring at the proficiency level.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of grades 1-5 students achieving proficiency level will increase from 57% to at least 65% as compared between the 2019 to the 2020 ELA Winter MAP.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Provide professional development to better understand and implement standards-based curriculum, rigor strategies and classroom routines that impact time management with differentiating instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was selected based on changes in curriculum and staff. We have to make sure our students are engaged in more rigorous, differentiated tasks with the updated and revised curriculum while staying aligned to the state standards in order to ensure more of our students are making yearly learning gains, while also increasing teacher knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Facilitate ELA-focused, consistent and sustained professional development with a focus on standards-based instruction.
2. Deliver instruction in both reading and writing designed according to research-based principles, which would include the "gradual release of responsibility" model of teaching.
3. All students will have access to grade level text and beyond, as well as, small group instruction based on data.
4. Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with high quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback.
5. Support K-2 teachers and students by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching and feedback.
6. Schedule at least one teacher peer observation (lead by ELA Champions) with quality feedback using the ELA walk-through tool to monitor standards-based instruction, gradual release, use of grade level text, engagement and level of feedback.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Burke (burkejenn@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 59% of the students in grades 1-5 scored at the proficiency level on the 2019 Math Winter MAP. The lowest scoring grade level was grade 1. 56% of grade 1 students scored at the proficiency level compared to 60% of grades 2-5 students scoring at the proficiency level. 14% of grade 1 Black students scored at the proficiency level compared to 26% of grades 2-5 Black students scoring at the proficiency level.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of grades 1-5 students achieving proficiency level on the winter assessment will increase from 59% to at least 65% as measured by the 2020 Math Winter MAP.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, and Number Routines to provide rigorous, student-centered instruction daily.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was selected based on changes in curriculum and staff. We have to make sure our students are engaged in more rigorous, differentiated tasks that support the standards based curriculum to ensure more of our students are making ongoing learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Actively participate in PLCs to complete a planning protocol for each upcoming unit.
2. Implement daily Number Routines at the start of the math block.
3. Assess and analyze MAP, unit assessment and Dreambox Learning data to inform instruction.
4. Monitor Dreambox usage to be a minimum of five lessons completed per week per student.
5. Schedule at least one teacher peer observation with quality feedback using the Mathematics Effective Teaching Practices tool to monitor standards-based instruction at the appropriate taxonomy level.
6. Utilize multiple forms of assessment to diagnose and accelerate learning.
7. Allow students to represent and share their thinking in multiple ways.

Person Responsible: Erica Austin (austine@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 56% of the students in grades 3-5 scored at the proficiency level on the 2020 science cycle 2 assessment. Grade 4 was the lowest scoring grade level at the 38% proficiency level.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of all grades 3-5 students achieving science proficiency will increase from 56% to 65% as measured by the 2021 science cycle 2 assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Effectively implement and monitor science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model, science labs, and vocabulary activities in alignment with grades 3-5 standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on the 2019 Science Diagnostic Assessment data, Earth science requires the most review. Lack of vocabulary comprehension from grades 3-5 standards requires a deeper understanding and opportunities for integration.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide ongoing professional development for the 5E instructional model.
2. Implement and monitor science vocabulary academic gaming based on data.
3. Develop, implement, and monitor a data driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th Grade Diagnostic Assessment.
4. Implement and analyze Gr. 4 and 5 unit assessments to identify lowest scoring standards and adjust plans to include integration during ELA small group and academic gaming, especially for grade 5 students to support Life Science content lost during grade 4 learning from COVID 19.
5. Administration will monitor lesson plans for use of 10-70-20 instructional routine.

Person Responsible: Debora Bailey (baileydeb@pcsb.org)

#4. Other specifically relating to AVID

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Implementation of instructional strategies from AVID CRT will be used to increase engagement of diverse learners.
---	---

Measurable Outcome:	The percent of grades 1-5 students achieving proficiency level will increase from 57% to at least 65% as compared between the 2019 to the 2020 ELA Winter MAP.
----------------------------	--

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org)
---	------------------------------------

Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase the staff capacity to support students with Culturally Relevant Teaching (CRT).
---------------------------------	--

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Participating in professional development for AVID CRT will give teachers more insight, and tools to use, with diverse learners. 39% (17 /46) have completed the course as of June 2020.
---	--

Action Steps to Implement

1. Conduct a "Wake Up with AVID" school-based training session each grading period to support WICOR.
2. Monitor K-5 Progression Plan that outlines WICOR strategies expected to be implemented in each grade.
3. Each class will create a SMART goal to support ELA achievement that will be posted and referenced. Teachers will create SMART goals with their Black students to discuss at administrator/teacher and teacher/student data chats.
4. Teachers/Staff obtain the gifted micro-credential to be better able to utilize questions to help students elaborate on content.
5. Teachers intentionally plan for differentiation (using MAP or FSA data) for gifted and talented learners and administrators monitor and provide feedback.
6. 50% of instructional staff will complete AVID CRT district training.

Person Responsible	Jamie Loubet (loubetj@pcsb.org)
---------------------------	---------------------------------

#5. Other specifically relating to Bridging the Gap**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

57% of all students in grades 1-5 scored at the proficiency level on the 2019 ELA Winter MAP.
34% of grades 1-5 Black students scored at the proficiency level and 59% Non-black students in grades 1-5 scored proficiency on the same assessment.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

The 25% gap between Black and Non-black students meeting proficiency levels between the Winter ELA MAP 2019 and Winter ELA MAP 2020 will decrease by 10%.

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

The teacher will connect students to academic content through practices that are culturally relevant and responsive.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

This strategy will promote equity within classroom culture, lessons, and resources.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize culturally rich literature within classroom and school library.
2. Participate in professional development to support culturally relevant teaching (CRT).
3. Teachers will use guiding questions within the 6 M's framework when planning.
4. Teachers will reduce barriers to the curriculum resources and optimize levels of enrichment.
5. Administrators will give specific, actionable feedback to teachers on structures and strategies being used, such as class meetings, restorative practices, circles, and cooperative learning.

Person Responsible Tameka Harris (harristam@pcsb.org)

#6. Other specifically relating to Conditions for Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: From August 2019 to March 2020 data showed 28 discipline referrals, one in-school and one out-of school suspensions.

Measurable Outcome: We expect from August 2020 to March 2021 to have 23 or less discipline referrals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will incorporate more restorative practices between staff, students, and parents to establish and maintain positive relationships.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We will support a better understanding of equitable practices that engage students in acknowledging and adhering to processes and procedures. The specific strategy and actions within our SIP were selected to match our school-specific needs that were realized after completing an equity problem solving process.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review and share subgroup and grade level data monthly for trends and next steps with SAC, staff and students, including office call logs, incident referrals, positive referrals and discipline referrals.
4. During the fall semester, staff will utilize an inquiry stance to collect data on the state of relationships in their classrooms and identify small changes that can be made with individual students to increase trust and positive interactions.
5. During the first 10 days of school, teachers and students will collaboratively develop classroom agreements/rules that reflect the school-wide expectations by engaging student voices using fair process for all classes. Agreements/rules will be submitted to the PBIS Coordinator.
6. Classrooms will conduct weekly community building circles or class meetings to establish a "culture of care" that focus on positive relationships, interactions, shared classroom responsibility, empathy, use of "I" statements to express feelings and to demonstrate/practice active listening.

Person Responsible Kimberly Hall (hallki@pcsb.org)

1. Schedule professional development for classroom management and routines at the beginning and middle of the school year.
2. Coordinate ongoing professional development for Equity, CRT, and restorative practices.

Person Responsible Mary Ridge (ridgem@pcsb.org)

#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

57% of all students in grades 1-5 scored at the proficiency level on the 2019 ELA Winter MAP.
 34% of grades 1-5 Black students scored at the proficiency level and 59% Non-black students in grades 1-5 scored proficiency on the same assessment. The following is a breakdown by subgroup:
 Black- 34% (11 / 32)
 White- 61% (190 / 312)
 Hispanic- 50% (33 / 66)
 Asian- 62% (13 / 21)
 Multi- 62% (28 / 45)
 ELL- 26% (6 / 23)
 SWD- 51% (30 / 59)

**Measurable
Outcome:**

The 25% gap between Black and Non-black students meeting proficiency levels between the Winter ELA MAP 2019 and Winter ELA MAP 2020 will decrease by 10%.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Facilitate equity-centered problem solving for the adoption of equitable practices (equity centered PLC's, equity-centered SBLT).

Address mindset shift for the adoption of equitable practice by providing equity centered professional development.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

This strategy will promote equity within the classroom culture, lessons, and resources by providing teachers the opportunity to create lessons using a cultural lens.

By providing professional development, we should see a reduction in the achievement gap between various subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement**Strategy Action Steps:**

1. Teachers and administrators will monitor subgroup data four times per year using the equity-centered problem solving process during PLCs and SBLT to identify the amount the achievement gap decreased.
2. Teachers will use AVID CRT Classroom Audit and self-reflections to support classroom practices and student outcomes during preschool and third grading period.
3. Grade 3-5 students will complete a survey based on PBIS results during grading period two and four to empower student voice.

**Person
Responsible**

Tameka Harris (harristam@pcsb.org)

Professional Development Action Steps:

1. Administrators will examine changes in teacher practice using a CRT classroom walk-through tool four times per year to drive further training and celebrations to acknowledge.
2. Teachers will rate observable CRT practices through peer observation and provide meaningful feedback.

3. Culturally Relevant Training will be provided throughout the year via school-based and district-based trainers.
4. Staff will continue with the book study promoting Equity once per month.

Person Responsible Tameka Harris (harristam@pcsb.org)

#8. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 9% of our students were absent 10% or more from August 2019 to March 2020 school year with an average of 95% being in attendance daily.

Measurable Outcome: We expect our attendance rate to decrease from 9% being absent 10% or more of the year to 8% being absent 10% or more between August 2020 and March 2021. We would like to increase our average daily attendance rate 95% to 96%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all tiers on an ongoing basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Decreasing the percentage of students who are absent 10% or more from school will lead to higher student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Record keeping of attendance training session will be provided at a staff meeting during the first month of school.
2. Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis that also reflects the appropriate entry codes.
3. Implement and monitor attendance incentive programs.
4. Share data and effectiveness of school-wide attendance strategies regularly with staff and families.
5. Implement tier 2 and 3 plans for student specific needs and review barriers on a bi-weekly basis during child study team meetings.

Person Responsible Alexan Johnson (johnsonalex@pcsb.org)

#9. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase parent participation and understanding with student data, goals, and curriculum.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will conduct parent conferences for 100% of their students by the end of the first semester as opposed to the 97% the previous 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide academic tools and training for families to support their student's achievement at home. Meet with parent and students more often to provide them with a better understanding of the data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was selected so we can achieve learning gains for all students through a school-home connection.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create and utilize a checklist of critical discussion items to include during parent conferences.
2. New-to-Starkey teachers will participate in fishbowl and peer coaching professional development for effective parent conferences.
3. Provide virtual academic workshops for parents to support their student at home with content strategies.
4. Conduct data chats with parents and students (MAP, FSA, grade level standards) to assist them with better understanding implications of the data.
5. Host a Student Showcase of Learning Night for students to share and celebrate their progress with their families.
6. Support the Connect for Success program for online digital learning at home.
7. Provide Family Friendly Schools training for front office staff and Collaborating for Success training for instructional and support staff to enhance school-wide family engagement.

Person Responsible Kaitlyn Grasso (grassokai@pcsb.org)

#10. Other specifically relating to Healthy School

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of performance is Silver based on the 2019-2020 Healthy School application. Improved health and wellness will empower staff and students to develop better lifelong healthy habits.
Measurable Outcome:	We expect our performance level to increase from silver status to gold status as evidenced by 2020-2021 Healthy School application.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Optimize physical activity times at recess and incorporate movement within content lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy will create opportunities to increase health and fitness for students and staff.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Enhance recess area with more equipment.
2. Incorporate the 6 M's Instructional Model in lesson plans.
3. Monitor compliance with Pinellas County Nutritional Guidelines.
4. Incorporate wellness programs for staff.
5. Incorporate ELP's with movement for students

Person Responsible Amanda Bedinghaus (bedinghausam@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

In an effort to build the capacity of our parents we will look for innovative ways to provide our events whether digitally or in person due to COVID 19. We will offer Meet the Teacher, Pre-K and K Student Orientation, Back to School Night/Annual Title 1 Meeting, Volunteer Orientation, Goodies with Grandparents, Donuts with Dads, Muffins with Moms, Math Curriculum Training Night (for parents), Literacy Night Curriculum Training Night (for parents), Ready, Set, Kindergarten Night, Student Showcase of Learning Night, Science Showcase, SAC meetings, PTA meetings, Volunteer Café, School Tours, Dads Take Your Child to School Day and All Pro Dads.

Additionally, our staff will build their capacity by participating in Equity Training, Restorative Practices Training, Mental Health Training, and Conference Training to help create an atmosphere that is conducive to parent and family engagement and highest student achievement. We also coordinate with other federal programs such as VPK, IDEA, and Title 1.

Each year we review our compact and Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP). Parent input is essential to this process. Parents will be notified of the review at the final PTA and SAC meeting. We offer flexible meeting times by holding meetings in the evening, to reach as many parents as possible. Our Title I Annual Parent Meeting and Back to School Night will be held in September 2020. During this meeting we will discuss the Parent's Right to Know, What is Title I, the 2020-2021 Title 1 budget, the importance of parental involvement, curriculum and assessments.

We will communicate with parents via robo calls, student planners, planner labels, hard copies of materials, Peach Jar, e-mails, FOCUS, TEAMS, our marquee and our website. We will make every reasonable effort to provide our parents with information in an understandable language and format.

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				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	510-Supplies	4331 - Starkey Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Supplies will be needed to support differentiated instruction and literacy events with families.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	500-Materials and Supplies	4331 - Starkey Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$400.00
			<i>Notes: Math supplies will be purchased to support hands-on experiences and math events with families.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	7200	500-Materials and Supplies	4331 - Starkey Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$300.00
			<i>Notes: Materials will be used to support hands-on learning experiences and science projects throughout the year.</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: AVID				\$200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	510-Supplies	4331 - Starkey Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$200.00
			<i>Notes: Miscellaneous supplies will be needed to support the work staff and students will do with WICOR strategies.</i>			
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Bridging the Gap				\$350.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	120-Classroom Teachers	4331 - Starkey Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$350.00
			<i>Notes: Funding will be used to pay for data analysis and planning of subgroup data.</i>			
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Conditions for Learning				\$650.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	510-Supplies	4331 - Starkey Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$650.00
			<i>Notes: Funds will be used to support our PBIS rewards and Starkey Store.</i>			
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity				\$350.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	120-Classroom Teachers	4331 - Starkey Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$350.00
			<i>Notes: Funds will be used to support professional development focused on Equity.</i>			
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	510-Supplies	4331 - Starkey Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$200.00
			<i>Notes: Funds will be used for awards and incentives.</i>			
9	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement				\$200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	500-Materials and Supplies	4331 - Starkey Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$200.00
			<i>Notes: Supplies will be needed for Student Led Conference Night as well as materials to better support parents' understanding of data during parent conferences.</i>			

10	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy School				\$100.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	510-Supplies	4331 - Starkey Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$100.00
			<i>Notes: Supplies for staff and students will be needed to better understand and practice a healthier lifestyle.</i>			
Total:						\$3,250.00