

Pinellas County Schools

# Garrison Jones 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>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>38</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>39</b> |

## Garrison Jones Elementary School

3133 GARRISON RD, Dunedin, FL 34698

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

### Demographics

**Principal: Jennifer Tapia**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/9/2006

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 75%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (67%)<br>2017-18: C (53%)<br>2016-17: B (57%)<br>2015-16: C (53%)   |
| <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>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>39</b> |

## Garrison Jones Elementary School

3133 GARRISON RD, Dunedin, FL 34698

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | No                     | 50%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 40%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A       | A       | C       | 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.**

At Garrison-Jones Elementary, we believe that the purpose of education is to develop the whole child through a broad-based curriculum which fosters a positive self-concept, creativity, self-discipline, values and life skills.

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

100% Student success ~ We are Growing Greatness!

### 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        |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Buckles, Karen    | Principal           | Leader of the school and head learner. |
| Eash, Kim         | Teacher, K-12       | Kindergarten Team Leader               |
| Hash, Patricia    | Teacher, K-12       | 1st Grade Team Leader; SIP coordinator |
| Scavino, Ashley   | Teacher, K-12       | 2nd Grade Team Leader                  |
| Pollick, Erica    | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal                    |
| Hawkes, Kathy     | Teacher, K-12       | 3rd Grade Team Leader                  |
| Ward, Amy         | Teacher, K-12       | 4th Grade Team Leader                  |
| Schneider, Kelsie | Teacher, ESE        | ESE Team Leader                        |
| Visalli, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12       | ESOL Lead Teacher                      |
| Westrich, Ben     | Teacher, K-12       | Behavior Specialists                   |
| Poole, Rachel     | School Counselor    | Guidance Counselor                     |
| Skeim, Miriam     | Teacher, K-12       | Dual Language Team Leader              |
| Lister, Kelley    | Teacher, K-12       | Dual Language Team Leader              |
| Bagu, Katrina     | Teacher, K-12       | 5th Grade Team Leader                  |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Saturday 9/9/2006, Jennifer Tapia

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

2

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

5



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

47

**Demographic Data**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 75%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (67%)<br>2017-18: C (53%)<br>2016-17: B (57%)<br>2015-16: C (53%)   |
| <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               | 81          | 91 | 98 | 92 | 92 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 541   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 1           | 19 | 24 | 18 | 9  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 83    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 16 | 18 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 44    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 16 | 18 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 44    |

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

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

Thursday 7/9/2020

#### 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     | 79          | 84 | 102 | 89 | 87 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 530   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 10          | 10 | 12  | 5  | 8  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 52    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0  | 4   | 0  | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 2  | 19  | 7  | 35 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 96    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0   | 0  | 7  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2           | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |

#### 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           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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     | 79          | 84 | 102 | 89 | 87 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 530   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 10          | 10 | 12  | 5  | 8  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 52    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0  | 4   | 0  | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 2  | 19  | 7  | 35 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 96    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0   | 0  | 7  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2           | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |

**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           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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             | 69%    | 54%      | 57%   | 60%    | 53%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 71%    | 59%      | 58%   | 55%    | 53%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 60%    | 54%      | 53%   | 49%    | 47%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 71%    | 61%      | 63%   | 64%    | 62%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 74%    | 61%      | 62%   | 59%    | 61%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 62%    | 48%      | 51%   | 51%    | 48%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 62%    | 53%      | 53%   | 63%    | 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 | 64%    | 56%      | 8%                         | 58%   | 6%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 59%    | 53%      | 6%                         | 57%   | 2%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 66%    | 56%      | 10%                        | 58%   | 8%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 53%    | 51%      | 2%                         | 56%   | -3%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 13%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 74%    | 54%      | 20%                        | 56%   | 18%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 49%    | 50%      | -1%                        | 55%   | -6%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 25%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 21%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 64%    | 62%      | 2%                         | 62%   | 2%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 58%    | 62%      | -4%                        | 62%   | -4%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 62%    | 64%      | -2%                        | 64%   | -2%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 61%    | 62%      | -1%                        | 62%   | -1%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 83%    | 60%      | 23%                        | 60%   | 23%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 61%    | 61%      | 0%                         | 61%   | 0%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 22%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 22%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2019 | 60%    | 54%      | 6%                         | 53%   | 7%                      |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 2018 | 57%    | 57%      | 0%                         | 55%   | 2%                      |
| 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                                       | 50       | 53     |             | 50        | 40      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 52       | 60     | 43          | 49        | 61      | 44           | 39       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 80       |        |             | 90        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 54       | 63     | 44          | 61        | 77      | 63           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 73       | 75     | 72          | 74        | 73      | 60           | 68       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 58       | 60     | 50          | 59        | 66      | 59           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 12       | 14     |             | 29        | 40      |              | 9        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 29       | 32     | 32          | 43        | 55      | 57           | 17       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 83       |        |             | 75        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 43       | 20     |             | 57        | 80      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 42       | 39     | 32          | 51        | 59      | 53           | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 50       | 54     |             | 71        | 77      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 57       | 45     | 37          | 63        | 64      | 50           | 64       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 45       | 39     | 30          | 53        | 60      | 51           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 26       | 50     | 55          | 67        | 56      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 29       | 50     | 57          | 49        | 58      | 36           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 50       |        |             | 70        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 46       | 56     | 50          | 59        | 54      | 44           | 69       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 65       | 42     |             | 60        | 42      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 64       | 57     | 54          | 65        | 59      | 50           | 63       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 48       | 47     | 52          | 55        | 52      | 44           | 63       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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 |

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 68   |
| 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 | 76   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 545  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| 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                                       | 53   |
| 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  | 85   |
| 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                                 |      |
| 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    |
| Hispanic Students   |      |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students   | 61   |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO   |

| Hispanic Students  |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | N/A |
| 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   | 71  |
| 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                                | 60  |
| 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.**

2017-2018 Students with Disabilities (SWD) resulted in 12% in ELA proficiency. 2018-2019 SWD resulted in 35% proficiency.

2017-2018 Students with Disabilities (SWD) resulted in 29% in Math proficiency. 2018-2019 SWD resulted in 41% proficiency.

Breakdown of results by grade level:

-29% of proficiency in 3rd grade ELA and 14% proficiency in 3rd-grade math

-17% of proficiency in 4th grade ELA and 0% proficiency in 4th-grade math

-60% of proficiency in 5th grade ELA and 80% proficiency in 5th-grade math

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

All data components show increases to the previous year.

**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.**

4th Grade Math had a 1% increase from the previous year. One teacher from last year participated in our teacher to teacher observation program and made improvement from last year. Though the other three classes earned a 61%, 68%.and 73% proficiency rate, the grade level as a whole earned a 26% increase with our L25% students.

-3rd grade ELA increased by 5 points for a total of 64%, exceeding the state average of 58%.

-3rd grade Math increased by 6 points for a total of 64%, exceeding the state average of 62%.

-4th grade ELA increased by 13 points for a total of 66%, exceeding the state average of 58%.

\*\*4th grade Math increased by 1 point for a total of 62%, below the state average of 64%.

-5th grade ELA increased by 25 points for a total of 74%, exceeding the state average of 56%.

-5th grade Math increased by 22 points for a total of 83%, exceeding the state average of 60%.

-5th-grade Science increased by 3 points for a total of 60%, exceeding the state average of 53%.

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

5th Grade Math had the largest increase resulting in a gap with the state. Collaborative Planning was a big factor as well as the content knowledge of the teachers in fifth grade. The team leader planned with a peer for support and implementation. Two of the teachers participated in peer observations with other teachers (include multiple visits and feedback). ESE inclusion planned and worked with a strong teacher with a deep math knowledge base. In the moment data provided from AAR and MAP was valuable in PLCs and CP - honing in on bucket list with subgroups.

Data chats with individual teachers and grade level teachers along with weekly PLCs that dig deeper into student classroom data and providing enrichment or additional reteaching. MAP data show gains in predicted proficiency in most classes and administrative classroom observations with strategic planning for utilization and implementation of follow up on formative assessments/biweeklies (including actionable feedback and reteaching.) The use of formative assessments to reteach and differentiate instruction. Planning for rigorous student-centered standards-based instruction, small group focused and with fidelity, and independent reading with accountability. Student Goal setting in terms that made it manageable.

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

52 students missing 10% or more of the school year.

20 students who have 2 or more early warning indicators.

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

1. 60% or higher across all content year
2. Making gains in reading proficiency with an increase of writing using "Thinking Maps" and the use of a blended model using Nearpod, Canvas, and other technology resources.
3. Making gains in math proficiency with an increase of writing using different "Thinking Maps" and the use of a blended model using Nearpod, Canvas, and other technology resources.
4. Maintaining science proficiency 60% with an increase of writing using different "Thinking Maps" and the use of a blended model using Nearpod, Canvas, and other technology resources.
5. A heightened focus on social & emotional supports; virtual school assemblies by student services,



staff and resources provided by student services due to the COVID19 Pandemic and their online learning experience to ensure a smooth transition back to school.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Reading and writing are integral parts to student learning. In ELA we will continue to work on our goal from last year with an increased emphasis on writing. We found that a heavier emphasis on writing was the connection our Dual Language/EL/ESE students ignited learning.

Dual Language ELA teachers will continue planning and collaboration with eyes on grade level text. Work together is also based on Collaboration and Co Teach book study.

Strategies support DL/EL/ESE students.

Schoolwide Enrichment (SEM) is conducted once a week involving 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students in hands on projects starting with research.

Participation in Gifted C3 will assist with enriching and challenging ELA modules extension activities instruction for gifted and talented students. We will increase from 60% to 70% in proficiency on the 2021 Florida Standardized Assessment (FSA) in the area of Reading.

**Measurable Outcome:**

The percent of all students making gains in their reading proficiency will increase from 60% to 70% as measured by 2020-2021 ELA FSA scores. The percent of all students making learning gains will increase from 71% to 75%, as measured by the 2020-2021 ELA FSA scores. The percent of all L25 students reaching reading proficiency will increase from 60% to 65%, as measured by the 2020-2021 ELA FSA scores.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Karen Buckles (bucklesk@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- An increase in the use of technology platforms and resources like Nearpod, Canvas, and others across ELA/writing instructional strategies to help create a more blended instructional model
- Provide scaffolds for accessing grade level text.
- The use of differentiation through small group instruction with a larger focus of eyes on grade level texts
- ELA/Writing modules for core focuses on student accountability with a concentration of culturally relevant materials
- Increase in writing through the use of Thinking Maps
- Increase use of Project-Based learning strategies
- Continue to develop more meaningful and focused planning and collaboration within and across grade levels

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

~These strategies will allow ALL our students to meet their learning gains and expectations with making connections to culturally relevant evidence based strategies.

~The use of the blended model and the increased use of technology platforms allow the students to participate and interact with a greater focus on differentiated instructional strategies to meet the needs of all students.

~ The use of Thinking Maps will deepen student knowledge towards a sense of independence - supporting differentiation for each individual learner while enhance and developing writing skills.

~An increased use of Project Based Learning for all students to help increase student centered activities.

~The more defined collaboration and planning sessions within and across grade levels will help to provide time to focus on areas of focus in grade levels as well as school-wide, while allowing for teachers to collaborate and plan using the new forms of technology resources.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue implementing grade level and individual planning sessions focusing on grade level data through the use of data chats with a focus on specific student data and research based instructional strategies.
2. Continue to focus on writing with teacher and peer feedback consistently
3. Increase the use of Thinking Maps to help develop and strength writing skills. (This will take place across all grade levels).
4. Continue to provide opportunities for students to get eyes on cognitively complex resources that focus on student accountability with a concentration of culturally relevant materials for ALL students to be able to identify themselves with in the learning environment.
5. ELA modules or Lucy Caulkin's Reading/Writing units of study will be used with a focus on student accountability with a concentration of culturally relevant materials and resources to help build more culturally relevant classrooms. These learning modules will also increase complex tasks based on learning targets and over all BEST standards.
6. The incorporation of technology platforms to help create blended learning models in classrooms will be used with a focus on Canvas, Nearpod, and others.
7. Continue participation in Gifted E3 with administrators and co-teachers participating in a book study to increase their knowledge of this gifted learning program.
8. Provide opportunities for students to get eyes on grade level text in small reading groups with appropriate scaffolds to meet those grade level standards. \*1st grade through 5th grade will also be using NEWSELA- a online reading enrichment platform-- to increase reading stamina while be exposed to many different types of genres of texts that are at the students reading level. \* Also students who will benefit from Summer Bridge to continue to develop and build their reading skills will be encouraged to attend which will allow them to continue to build their reading skills while at the same time avoiding them falling one to two reading levels behind over the summer break.
9. Continue to have teachers video lessons and then collaborate with their peers to get feedback and ideas from one another of strategies that can be modified or implemented.

**Person Responsible** Erica Pollick (pollicke@pcsb.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The areas that we will focus on this year in mathematics is the increased use of technology platforms, iReady for overall math content instruction, backwards planning, Dreambox for interventions and enrichment activities, and the use of Math Number Talks during math instruction. We will also continue or work with the MLTI study group to help increase mathematics instructional strategies and knowledge.

Rationale: The purpose of using these strategies in this area of math is to help our students reach their highest level of mathematics achievement while at the same time providing opportunities for teachers to strength their instructional practice and deepen their content knowledge. We will also be including a greater focus on the inclusion and use of technology resources and learning platforms to create a more blended model of learning for all our students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

-- The percent of all students making gains learning gains will increase from 74% to 80% as measured by 2020-2021 Math FSA scores. The percent of all L25 students making learning gains will increase from 62% to 65%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Karen Buckles (bucklesk@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

~ Deepen our content knowledge in rich cognitively complex tasks that focuses on student accountability with a concentration of culturally relevant materials for ALL students to be able to identify themselves with in the learning environment.

~ Continue our PLC sessions in Math to build a deeper conceptual knowledge monthly with guidance from the teacher leaders who are part of the MTLI study group . These will occur monthly with a focus on standards and the use of vertical articulation. Also this work will be included in monthly faculty meetings.

~ Continue to increase math journaling with specific teacher feedback from peers and teachers with consistency.

~ Continue to grow Thinking Maps to help students increase their content knowledge in math with the heightened use of writing skills.

~ Continue to use iReady for math module lessons, and then allowing the students to use Dreambox to enrich or get more practice on mathematical concepts

~ Backwards unit planning with a focus on planning units with the end outcomes and a focus on the unit standards.

~ Developing and providing a blended learning environment in order to offer authentic learning experiences for all our students in mathematics.

~ Continue to use cognitively complex tasks with the use of project based learning activities to help our students reach their highest potential in math.

~ Providing culturally relevant learning opportunities for our students to make greater connections to mathematical concepts, while at the same time making connections to their own cultural backgrounds.

~ These strategies will allow ALL our students to deepen their conceptual understanding of number sense to meet their learning expectations and make connections to culturally relevant evidence based strategies.

**Rationale  
for  
Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:**

~ To grow as a school community teacher to teacher, teacher to students, student to student in mathematical concepts.

~ The use of Thinking Maps will provide increased opportunities for student centered, along with a built in differentiation for each individual learner and increased writing in the content of math.

~ An increased use of Project Based Learning for all students to help increase student centered activities,

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement complex and rigorous mathematical tasks using the iReady curriculum for daily instructional purposes, and using Dreambox for intervention and enrichment activities.
2. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards using intentional and collaborative planning centered around math descriptors. This will be done through monthly grade level collaborative planning sessions focusing on vertical articulation, math standards and instructional strategies. Grade teams will also use backwards design unit planning and thinking with student outcomes in mind.
3. Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks through our work with MTLI as well as an increased use of project based learning strategies.
4. Increased use of learning technology platforms like Canvas, Nearpod, and others to create a more blended learning model.
5. Continue to deepen teacher knowledge in using Number Routines during math.

**Person Responsible** Erica Pollick (pollicke@pcsb.org)

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | In Science we will continue to work on our goal from last year with an increased emphasis on writing across content areas. We will increase our students scoring from 60% to 70% proficiency on the 2020-2021 FSA in the area of Science.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | The percent of all students achieving science proficiency will be maintained at a level of 60% or higher, as measured by 2020-2021 FSA Science assessment scores.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Karen Buckles (bucklesk@pcsb.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | <p>~ Continue to provide cognitively complex tasks that focus on student accountability with a concentration of culturally relevant materials for ALL students to be able to identify themselves within the learning environment.</p> <p>~ Continue our deep focus on implementing the SLAGS and providing hands on learning in the Science Lab, as well as introducing STEM activities to students to enhance the Science learning block.</p> <p>~ Continue to increase journaling with feedback from peers and teachers consistently across content areas with fidelity.</p> <p>~Continue to grow Thinking Maps across content areas.</p> <p>~ Incorporate the use of more technology resources like Canvas, Nearpod, Virtual Field Trips, to help to create a more blended learning model.</p> <p>~ Incorporate the use of continuity guides</p> <p>~These strategies will allow ALL of our students to meet their learning gains expectations while making connections to culturally relevant evidence based strategies.</p> <p>~ The use of Thinking Maps across content areas will make the learning more student centered, along with a built in differentiation for each individual learner and an increase in writing strategies across all content areas.</p> |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | <p>~An increased use of STEM and hands-on activities for all students will increase student understanding through experience and discovery.</p> <p>~The increased development of technology uses in the classroom will allow our students to be taught in a more blended learning environment.</p>  |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the BEST science standards using intentional and collaborative planning. Teachers will incorporate the 10-70-20 model for science instructional needs
2. The increase in standards based instructional practices to ensure student rigor using complex tasks that will align to the standard. Teachers will monitor the students to support the “confirming the learning” portion of the instructional model through teacher and peer intentional feedback.
3. The use of thinking maps for science and academic vocabulary to increase student understanding and writing within all content areas.
4. Develop implement and monitor a data driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th grade Diagnostic Assessment.
5. We will implement 4th & 5th grade unit assessments, identify low performing standards, add low performing standards to the fifth grade review plan.
6. Continue to provide opportunities for students to get eyes on cognitively complex resources that focus on student accountability with a concentration of culturally relevant materials for ALL students to be able to identify themselves with in the learning environment.
7. The use of technology resources like Canvas, Nearpod, and others to create a more blended learning

environment.

8. The teachers will use continuity guides to help students set learning goals and achievable outcomes, while provide lessons that build upon prior learning experiences.

**Person Responsible** Erica Pollick (pollicke@pcsb.org)

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

We will continue working with our black students making learning gains in the area of ELA as measured by the ELA FSA results. We will also use the REAP data to see changes in staff practices in culturally relevant teaching.

**Measurable  
Outcome:**

The percent of black students will continue making learning gains in ELA by maintaining 60% or higher as measured by May 2020-2021 ELA FSA results. We also focus on REAP data in ELA to increase proficiency and learning gains.

**Person  
responsible  
for  
monitoring  
outcome:**

Karen Buckles (bucklesk@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:**

~REAP data to guide professional development to increase equity practices  
~Strengthen the implementation of research-based practices that communicate high expectations for each student.  
~Support the implementation engagement strategies that support the development of social and instructional teaching practices.  
~Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans.  
~Ensure staff has access to real-time data specific to black students in order to have effective data chats and targeted support for improved learning.  
~Develop the use of technology platforms like Canvas, Nearpod, Virtual Field trips and others to offer a more blended learning environment.

**Rationale for  
Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:**

~The use of these strategies will allow us to help our students to bridge the learning gap in the area of ELA based off our REAP data results, with a focus on reading and writing strategies that are researched based and differentiated to meet the needs of unique learners.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Continue to increasing awareness of restorative practices in all classrooms for all teachers and students to align with conditions for learning. Teacher will continue to have daily meetings to build restorative practices into their daily lesson plans.
2. Teachers will continue to implement strategies to allow for all learners to feel welcome with a focus on skills and strategies learned from our Equity Champions and AVID Culturally Relevant training's.
3. Continue provide cognitively complex tasks that focuses on student accountability with a concentration of culturally relevant materials for ALL students to be able to identify themselves with in the learning environment.
4. Teachers will continue to develop culturally responsive learning activities that include flexible seating, voice



and choice to meet the needs of student diverse learning styles.

5. Teachers will continue to participate in PD for Equity Champions and AVID Culturally Relevant Training (monthly PLC's).

6. The use of Thinking Maps will allow for an increase in writing across content areas for all our students.

7. The development and use of The House system to promote positive choices and behaviors.

8. An increase use of technology to help to create a more blended learning environment.

9. We will use the REAP data to increase equity and the use of best practices to build a more culturally relevant learning environment.

10. We will use the data collected through conditions for learning, assessment data, and REAP data to help

promote a positive classroom learning environment where students set learning goals, track their own growth, and celebrate their learning accomplishments. Teachers will monitor and inspect the outcomes and use that data to guide instructional practices and to set goals for individual students. Student and teachers and students and student collaboration and learning conferences will take place to provide feedback and help to set attainable learning goals.

**Person Responsible** Erica Pollick (pollicke@pcsb.org)

**#5. Other specifically relating to Conditions for Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Studying our school conditions helps us to seek ways to reach and teach all students. We will continue building awareness of students who come from traumatic backgrounds, our large boy population, as well as all subgroups with a focus on social and emotional learning strategies. We will use lessons from Sanford Harmony to support restorative practice circles. We will grow in our planning to support culturally relevant instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of all students who come from traumatic backgrounds and all other subgroups will continue to increase their learning gains in Mathematics and ELA on the 2020-2021 FSA assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Karen Buckles (bucklesk@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- ~Strengthen the implementation of research-based practices that communicate high expectations for each student.
- ~Support the implementation engagement strategies that support the development of social and emotional instructional teaching practices.
- ~Focus on developing and maintaining Conditions for Learning across all classrooms and grade levels
- ~Continue using our School Wide Positive Behavior Supports (PBiS) along with the inclusion of HOUSE
- ~These strategies will allow ALL our students to meet their learning gains expectations with making connections to culturally relevant evidence based strategies.
- ~ The use of Thinking Maps across content areas will make the learning more student centered, along with a built in differentiation for each individual learner.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

- ~ An increased use of Project Based Learning for all students to help increase student centered activities
- ~ Conditions for learning will allow our teachers to put systems in place to help support the academic learning environment with a focus on building a positive and culturally relevant classrooms through the use of teachers and students using data to set goals and celebrate academic and behavior goals.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Develop a restorative classroom culture to help learners meet high academic, and social-emotional learning expectations.
2. Recognize and respond to the need of learners to connect to school/ classroom community by using restorative practices to actively promote trust, empathy, collaboration, and social learning skills.
3. Actively display, (re)-teach and implement school-wide Tier 1 practices and strategies.
4. Conduct and continuously improve on RP circles on a daily basis.
5. Use restorative practices to help learners to feel socially, emotionally and academically connected to peers and enhance self-awareness.
6. Increase social and emotional curriculum, support, resources including: morning meetings/restorative circles, school assemblies at the beginning of each semester, using Microsoft Forms to survey the

students

about their needs, to provide support, counseling, and check-ins.

7. Provide on site training focused on Conditions for learning with our on staff training facilitator.

8. Provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate about strategies that they are using through their PLC's that promote conditions for learning.

**Person Responsible** Erica Pollick (pollicke@pcsb.org)

## #6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** We will continue to encourage students/families to attend school on a daily basis to help them achieve their academic goals and expectations.

**Measurable Outcome:** We will increase student attendance from 88% to 93%. The percent of all students missing more than 10% will decrease from 11% to 8%, as measured by data collected from attendance dashboard.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Karen Buckles (bucklesk@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.  
~Strengthen the implementation of Tier I interventions to address and support the needs of students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** We know that students need to be present in their classrooms in order for learning to take place. Continue to celebrate classrooms with the highest attendance. Also, continue our practice to recognize students at our monthly Round Up. By focusing on increasing student attendance and expectations for student attendance we will be able to maintain or increase our academic expectations for all learners.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Celebrate classrooms with the highest attendance each month - posted on their door.
2. Celebrate students at our monthly student recognition program.
3. Conference with students.
4. Make parent phone calls.
5. Implement small group breakfast/lunch groups. Use culturally relevant activities to help increase student connectedness.
6. Provide the use of more technology platforms to create a more blended learning environment.

**Person Responsible** Erica Pollick (pollicke@pcsb.org)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** We will continue to develop a strong Family Engagement through morning and evening activities and programs. We recognize the importance of family involvement. We will survey families on what interests them about their child's school and education. We want parents to feel connected and recognize student success is tied to the school/family partnership. This is an integral part of our schools mission and vision, as well as academic goals to support highest student achievement.

**Measurable Outcome:** We will increase our volunteer hours from 1688 in 2019 to 1700 hours by the end of 2021.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Karen Buckles (bucklesk@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- ~ Continue with our It Starts With Hello Campaign
- Increase opportunities for parents to come on campus to reinforce the commitment between school and their child.
- ~ Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in a manner which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
- ~ Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.
- ~ Increase use of technology resources to communicate with all stakeholders and community to help develop a more blended school model.
- ~ Develop more of a focus on digital learning from home-to-school, to school-to-home using platforms like Canvas, Nearpod, and others.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** By supporting the academic goals for this school year and with a strong connection between the community and the school we will be able to help all our students meet the goals set in the 2019-2020 School improvement plan. Below are some ways in which we currently support our school community, as well as will continue to support and expand.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- 1 .Effectively communicate with families about their students' progress and school processes/practices.
2. Provide academic tools to families in support of their students' achievement at home.
3. Purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to advocate for their students.
- 4 .Intentionally build positive relationships with families and community partners.
5. We will develop a parent, staff, and community toolkit where we provide resources virtually to parents to support student learning, virtual and live parent information seminars on learning techniques that will enhance student achievement, resources and training for staff to support conditions for learning, and collect data using survey results based on wants and needs of these resources for our parents, staff, and community.
6. We will develop parent information sessions and staff professional development based on students data collected from assessments and our School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) in order to continue to promote and provide conditions for learning that support a positive and culturally relevant learning environment.

**Person Responsible** Erica Pollick (pollicke@pcsb.org)

#### #8. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our staff and students will continue to focus on healthy eating habits and activities to gain an optimal healthy lifestyle.

**Measurable Outcome:** Our school will be eligible in 5 out of 6 modules for bronze recognition by April 2021 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Framework. We would like to increase to the silver recognition by April of 2021.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Karen Buckles (bucklesk@pcsb.org)

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

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The number of all students designing and implementing their own individualized physical activity and fitness plans will increase from 10% to 80%, as measured by the modules for The Alliance for a Healthier Generation and student Fitness Grams.

#### Action Steps to Implement

- 1 Assemble a Healthy School Team made up of a minimum of four (4) individuals including, but not limited to:  
PE Teacher/Health Teacher, Classroom Teacher, Wellness Champion, Administrator, Cafeteria Manager, Parent, and Student.
2. Attend district-supported professional development (Kelley Lister)
3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment (Kelley Lister)
4. Complete the SMART Snacks in School Documentation (Michelle Puetsche- Cafe Manager)
5. Develop and Implement Healthy School Program Action Plan (Healthy School Team)

**Person Responsible** Kelley Lister (listerk@pcsb.org)

**#9. Other specifically relating to Gender Gap**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** ~ Our boy population is very large in many of our classrooms. We understand that boys learn differently than girls. We will conduct another book study, apply for a grant to support our work, and take steps towards expanding our knowledge based on reaching our boy learners. We are utilizing HOUSE for our school wide PBIS this year. The organization of teams and competition within houses will benefit our boy's needs while providing further structure and outlets for behavior. Our work will focus on topics of interest as well as learning opportunities that are geared towards these learners. We will continue to utilize the flexible seating purchased with last year's grant money and continue on expanding the ideals of flexible seating throughout the school.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of male students achieving ELA proficiency will be maintained 60% or higher, as measured by May 2020-2021 FSA ELA results.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Karen Buckles (bucklesk@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** ~ Strengthen the implementation of research-based practices that communicate high expectations for each student.  
~ Support the implementation engagement strategies that support the development of social and instructional teaching practices.  
~ Book study prefacing boy developmental phases and formulate responsive strategies that center on voice, movement, and choice.  
~ Increase productive competition with academics and athletics and monthly school wide SEL activities with in Houses.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** ~ These strategies will allow ALL our students to meet their learning gains expectations with making connections to culturally relevant evidence based strategies.  
~ The use of Thinking Maps across content areas will make the learning more student centered, along with a built in differentiation for each individual learner.  
~ An increased use of Project Based Learning for all students to help increase student centered activities.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Create learning environment where students feel they belong and are welcomed utilizing culturally relevant strategies.
2. Continuously reflect on and improve personal teaching practices utilized in meeting the needs of each and every student.
3. Use restorative practices to help learners to feel socially and academically connected to peers and enhance self-awareness.
4. Include the use of RP to model and teach professional behaviors and grow student's and staff's social and emotional competency to strengthen school community.
5. Develop, submit, and continuously implement classroom management plan that incorporates PBIS and RP in alignment with the SWBP.

**Person Responsible:** Erica Pollick (pollicke@pcsb.org)

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Emphasis on writing across content areas, as well as an increased exposure to grade level text with scaffolds helps prepare students on the trajectory of learning. Study focused on Collaboration and Co Teaching provides a way of work (in partnership) between ESE and gen ed teacher.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | We will also continue to work to maintain our students scoring 60% or higher in proficiency on the 2021 Florida Standardized Assessment (FSA) in the area of Reading. The percent of ESE students achieving ELA learning gains will be maintained at a level of 60% or higher, as measured by 2020-2021 FSA ELA results.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Karen Buckles (bucklesk@pcsb.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | <p>~ Students requiring ESE services work towards mastery of meaningful 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)</p> <p>~ Continue to provide grade level tasks with scaffolding - that focus on student accountability with a concentration of culturally relevant materials for ALL students to be able to identify themselves within the learning environment.</p> <p>~ Continue using data proven curriculum and resources to expose students to grade level text and tasks</p> <p>~ Continue to increase journaling with feedback from peers and teachers consistently across content areas with fidelity.</p> <p>~ Continue to grow Thinking Maps across content areas.</p> |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | <p>~ These strategies will allow our ESE students to maintain or move towards proficiency.</p> <p>~ Provide learning that connects to culturally relevant evidence based strategies.</p> <p>~ The use of Thinking Maps across content areas will make the learning more student centered, along with a built in differentiation for each individual learner.</p> <p>~ An increased use of Project Based Learning for all students to help increase student centered activities</p>  |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Collaborate with classroom teachers to develop standards-based lesson plans for our ESE students.
2. Support the use of academic language by providing additional support and instruction to help our ESE students to be able to recognize and identify academic language.
3. Continue the use of Thinking Maps to support student differentiated learning.
4. The use of project-based learning to promote on-grade level expectations at the students cognitive ability level.
5. Increased use of Thinking Maps in all content areas to promote increased writing skills.
6. The development and use of technology platforms like Canvas, Nearpod, Virtual Field Trips and others to create a blended learning environment.

**Person  
Responsible** Erica Pollick (pollicke@pcsb.org)



**#11. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Students learning to acquire a second language need lots of exposure, experiences, and strategic scaffolds to their learning. We focus small group learning for our EL in the primary grades to receive the foundational skills to become independent learners. We also know that a dual language education broadens the learning environment to successfully use both languages to rise on the learning trajectory.

**Measurable Outcome:** In ESOL we will continue to work on our goal from last year with an increased emphasis on writing across content areas, as well as eyes on grade level text. We will also continue to work to maintaining our students scoring 60% or higher, in learning gains on the 2020-2021 Florida Standardized Assessment (FSA) in the area of Reading.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Karen Buckles (bucklesk@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- ~ Utilize and monitor the implementation of Can Do Name charts and the Model Performance Indicators in the planning practice within all classrooms to endure the instruction matches the needs of ELs and scaffolding
- provides an appropriate entry point for grade-level content with ongoing student feedback.
- ~ Enhance staff capacity to strategically plan and implement lessons which meet the needs of English learners.
- ~ Provide instruction with eyes on grade level text with scaffolds.
- ~ Classroom teacher and EL teacher to collaborate and plan on information from Collaboration and Co Teaching.
- ~ Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
- ~ Go to the next level with our book study Collaboration and Co Teaching.
- ~ These strategies will allow our ESOL students to progress along the continuum of learning by making connections to culturally relevant evidence based strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

- ~ The use of Thinking Maps across content areas will make the learning more student centered, along with a built in differentiation for each individual learner.
- ~ An increased use of Project Based Learning for all students to help increase student centered activities
- ~ The use of technology platforms will increase students learning while allowing them access to a more blended learning environment.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Collaborative planning between classroom teachers and EL Resource teachers to develop standards-based lesson plans for our ELL students.
2. Support the use of academic language by using the ELA Standards with Model Performance Indicators for English Learners and Academic Vocabulary Instruction book with our ELL students.
3. Continue the use of Thinking Maps to support student differentiated learning and increase writing across content areas.
4. The use of a 50/50 model in the Dual Language Magnet classrooms.
5. Instruction is based on the students needs and with the use of differentiated strategies.

6. Project-based learning to expose the students to on grade level culturally relevant and cognitively complex tasks and resources while build background knowledge and experiences.
7. The use of technology platforms like Canvas, Nearpod, and others to create a more blended learning environment.

**Person Responsible** Erica Pollick (pollicke@pcsb.org)

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Research supports cluster grouping when paired with teachers knowledgeable in gifted strategies that expand on differentiation. In addition to clustering, our teachers have participated in micro-credentialing and/or earned gifted endorsement. Differentiation for gifted and talented students is necessary to remove the ceiling of learning growth.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | We will move all of our level 3 gifted students to a level 4 or above on the 2020-2021 Florida Standardized Assessment (FSA) in the content areas of Reading and Math.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Karen Buckles (bucklesk@pcsb.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | <p>~ Staff PD to increase student engagement in complex tasks.</p> <p>~ Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.</p> <p>~ Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.</p> <p>~ Continue to support the social and emotional needs of the gifted child.</p>  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | <p>This year we will study the impact of cluster grouping to support differentiation of instruction to better meet the needs of our gifted and talented learners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* We will continue intentional cluster grouping of gifted learners in grades 4 &amp; 5</li> <li>* More teachers will earn gifted micro-credential and/or gifted endorsement</li> <li>* We will continue to plan for intentional differentiation for our gifted learners</li> <li>* We will continue to plan ELA Module Extensions for above grade level learners</li> <li>* We will continue to plan and implement rich math tasks through MTLI.</li> <li>* We will seek PD on differentiation of the modules for 4th and 5th grade teachers</li> <li>* Teachers and administrators will take part in a collaborative book study focusing on the EC3 gifted learning model.</li> </ul> |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers intentionally plan for differentiation (using MAP or FSA data) for gifted learners and administrators monitor and provide feedback.
2. Teachers/staff obtain the gifted micro-credential and/or the gifted endorsement so that they can better differentiate for gifted learners.
3. Cluster group gifted and talented students so that the process of differentiating is more effective for gifted learners.
4. Pretest gifted students in order to better differentiate and meet their needs. Allow gifted students to utilize "curriculum compacting" as a means for differentiation and/or scaffolding
5. Pace learning for gifted learners in response to students individual needs. Differentiate for gifted learners through adapting content, thinking skills, resources, and/or objectives
6. Teachers attend professional development on "differentiation for gifted learners"
7. Administrators recommend that Deliberate Practice Plans incorporate opportunities for growth in the area of differentiating for gifted learners.

8. Administrators and Co-Teachers will participate in a book study to gain a deeper understanding of the EC3 gifted learning strategies.

9. An increased use of technology platforms to create a more blended learning environment while expose the gifted learners to enrichment activities outside the classroom setting.

**Person Responsible** Erica Pollick (pollicke@pcsb.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

### **Building Relational Capacity**

- Establish, create and develop a positive school-wide system and culture
- Continue formative assessments to Guide instruction and track Student progress with relentless inspection of the learning

• Continue restorative Practices through all grade levels with a focus of Social Emotional learning.

\* Continue Boy Study through book study, grant, and House Initiative.

### **Empowering Student Voice/ Respecting Experiences**

- Continue provide cognitively complex tasks that focuses on student accountability with a concentration of culturally relevant materials for ALL students to be able to identify themselves with in the learning environment.

• Continue our deep focus on Reading Units of Study within our research study group ~ development of the architecture of a mini-lesson with an addition of rigorous writing to enhance the ELA learning block.

• Continue to increase journaling with feedback from peers and teachers consistently across content areas with fidelity.

• Continue the use of student centered activities with a focus on rigor.

• Continue to grow Thinking Maps across content areas.

### **Hold High Expectations/Equitable Outcomes**

• We will continue to plan intentional and collaborative instruction with a focus on a high level of rigor and differentiation for all learners.

• Continue to develop learning expectations based on identified key standards and pre-assessment data

• Continue to enhance staff capacity in identifying critical content from curriculum standards Strategies to help gain meet our SIP goals for the 2020-2021 school year:

• MTLI Math research study USF program

• EC3 Gifted Program

• Reading Units of study research groups

• Writing add across content area and school-wide (including specials and common areas) focus on Mentor

texts and mentor writing to increase rigor-- focus on the use of Thinking Maps in all content areas.

• Writing samples in ELA shared in PLC's and CP

• Add Read to Me with 4th & 5th grade gifted groups paired with bucket kids in Kindergarten thru 2nd grade

• Add Intermediate student mentors for bucket primary kids (combine with Read to Me)

• Science Quizlet during 5th grade lunches throughout the year

~ Continued use of Thinking Maps- across all content areas

~ Gifted Learning Strategies in all grade levels

~ Developing and the increased use of technology platforms like Canvas, Nearpod, and others to build a blended

learning model to offer options for students and parents to participate virtually with the classroom through live, recorded and interactive lessons.

## 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.

Please see our Planning for Improvement, we have family engagement listed in that section with a rational, strategies, and action steps. Below are some of the following ways that we develop and maintain a positive school environment for all stakeholders:

By supporting the academic goals for this school year and with a strong connection between the community and the school we will be able to help all our students meet the goals set in the 2020-2021 School improvement plan. Below are some ways in which we currently support our school community, as well as will continue to support and expand.

~ Communication ~ Meet & Greet, Open House, Grandparents meetings, Parent Workshops, Fall/Spring Student Led Conferences, School Newsletter, School Website, PTA newsletter, Planners/Agenda, Parent Conferences, Marquee, Weekly Connect Ed messages, flyers, Technology Platforms: Clever, Canvas, Nearpod and others.

~ Parent Workshops ~ AVID workshop, SAC Parent Night, FSA Parent Workshop, PTA Meetings, ESOL Parent

Workshop; Left Brain/Right Brain How Students learn Parent Information Night

~ Relationships with Parents/Community ~ Monthly Round-Up Celebrations, Veteran's Day, Grandparents Day,

Kindergarten Boo-Who Breakfast, International Night, Olympic Field Days, Everything Garrison-Jones Night,

Math Night, Science Night, All-Pro Dads, Chorus Concerts, Talent Show, Father Daughter Dance, Mother Son

Movie Night, Volunteer Luncheon, Branch Ranch

~ We will use student assessment data outcomes as well as survey data collected from our parents and community to build and hold workshops -both in person and virtually- to meet the needs of our stakeholders.

~ We will provide professional training for our staff focusing on Conditions for Learning to ensure we are building

positive classroom environments where teachers use data to set learning goals, while students set their own

learning goals, track their own data, and celebrate their learning outcomes. The training will be offered and provided by our on-site Conditions for Learning facilitator.

~ We will begin to build our schools virtual library that parents and staff can access that will include the following:

- a. Professional Training for Instructional staff
- b. Parent Training/Webinars – Raising the Bar
- c. Equity and Family Engagement
- d. Resources/Tools

e. Accountability/Assessment Tools/Measurable goals

f. Parent Information & Advocacy

These resources will be added over time and based off of parent, staff, and stakeholders feedback through the

use of surveys and school feedback both virtually and in person.

~ We will develop and incorporate a plan to collect data on parents, staff, and stakeholders engagement with the

school in order to enhance communication and feedback while offering meaningful offer resources for our school community to promote student achievement with a focus on goal setting and celebrating academic achievement goals that have been reached.

### **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               | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math              | \$0.00        |
| 3             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science           | \$0.00        |
| 4             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity | \$0.00        |
| 5             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Conditions for Learning            | \$0.00        |
| 6             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | \$0.00        |
| 7             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement | \$0.00        |
| 8             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools                    | \$0.00        |
| 9             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Gender Gap                         | \$0.00        |
| 10            | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00        |
| 11            | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners  | \$0.00        |
| 12            | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Gifted                             | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |   | <b>\$0.00</b> |