
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Maximo Elementary School

4850 31ST ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

<http://www.maximoelementary.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Austin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2020

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Maximo Elementary School

4850 31ST ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

<http://www.maximoelementary.com/>

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	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	93%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Maximo Elementary School is to ensure rigorous educational opportunities, promote highest student achievement, and inspire students to become leaders beyond the classroom.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide every scholar with equitable and rigorous standards based instruction in order for him/her to successfully make at least a year's growth of learning.

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
Moses, Tekoa	Principal	
Riley, Cassandra	Instructional Coach	
Pe, Cheryl	Psychologist	
Woody, Patrick	Other	
Johnson, Tenishelah	Assistant Principal	
Hutton, Carol	Instructional Coach	
Daughtry, Jasmine	Instructional Coach	Promote teacher growth and scholar learning
Rodenbaugh, Jamey	Attendance/Social Work	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/14/2020, Lisa Austin

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.*

8

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	34	59	88	77	56	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387
Attendance below 90 percent	1	33	57	40	30	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	47	34	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/14/2020

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	51	85	75	82	65	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	414
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	7	7	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	5	8	8	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	27	17	55	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	27	25	43	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144

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	1	4	1	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	51	85	75	82	65	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	414
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	7	7	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	5	8	8	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	27	17	55	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	27	25	43	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144

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	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	30%	54%	57%	29%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	59%	58%	39%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	54%	53%	59%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	34%	61%	63%	36%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	61%	62%	49%	61%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	48%	51%	42%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	53%	53%	29%	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	33%	56%	-23%	58%	-25%
	2018	22%	53%	-31%	57%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	29%	56%	-27%	58%	-29%
	2018	34%	51%	-17%	56%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	25%	54%	-29%	56%	-31%
	2018	25%	50%	-25%	55%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	34%	62%	-28%	62%	-28%
	2018	20%	62%	-42%	62%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	23%	64%	-41%	64%	-41%
	2018	27%	62%	-35%	62%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	39%	60%	-21%	60%	-21%
	2018	46%	61%	-15%	61%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	31%	54%	-23%	53%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	30%	57%	-27%	55%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	17	50		25	65						
BLK	27	48	62	29	54	68	27				
HSP	50			58							
WHT	56	55		69	64						
FRL	29	50	65	29	52	68	29				
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	9	27		22	20						
BLK	25	47	50	28	51	54	29				
HSP	36			55							
WHT	50	69		36	38						
FRL	29	51	48	33	48	50	31				
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	10	9		19	45						
BLK	27	39	68	33	46	45	21				
HSP				36							
WHT	38			46							
FRL	26	40	57	33	49	42	28				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	330
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	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	54
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	

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	61
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	46
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA proficiency according to 2018 FSA. When looking at formative assessment data it can be determined that Math proficiency and learning gains showed the lowest performance. The contributing factor to low performance was foundational skills in ELA and mathematics, inconsistent use of IPG's to provide teachers with standards -based feedback. According to Florida Standards Assessment and Every Student Succeeds Act 2018/2019 scholars with disabilities showed the lowest performance.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was the learning gains of the Lowest 25 scholars in both English Language Arts and Math according to the Winter MAP results. The factors contributing to this decline included a need to plan for corrective instruction for L25 scholars (intervention hour), monitoring iReady minutes in English Language Arts and Math,

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.

The data component that showed the greatest gap in comparison to the state average was the proficiency and gains of our students with disabilities. The factors that contributed to this gap was a need for consistent collaborative planning between classroom teachers and teachers of students with disabilities.

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

The data component that displayed the greatest improvement was the learning gains of our L25 scholars in math. The actions the school took included a focus on the aspects of rigor, target-task alignment, collaborative planning, and focus on the major work of the grade level.

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

Scholar proficiency in reading and math
Proficiency and learning gains of scholars with disabilities

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

1. English Language Arts proficiency
2. Students with disabilities
3. Math proficiency
4. English Language Arts learning gains
5. Science achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Instructional Practice was selected because when looking at our data in ELA, Math, and Science, our goal is to increase scholar learning and proficiency. To promote scholar learning we must improve instructional practice.

Measurable Outcome: Presently we have 31% of scholars proficient in ELA. The 2020/21 ELA goal is 32%. Presently we have 34% of scholars proficient in Math. The 2020/21 Math goal is 36% Presently we have 34% of scholars proficient in Science. The 2020/21 Science goal is 35% Presently we have 48% of L25 scholars made ELA learning gains. The 2020/21 goal is 65% Presently we have 50% of L25 scholars made Math learning gains. The 2020/21 goal is 70%

Through consistent high quality instructional practice our scholars will meet the above goals for the 2020/2021 school year according to the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jasmine Daughtry (daughtryj@pcsb.org)

Profession Learning Communities (PLC)
 Professional learning communities will be focused on standards-based planning, student work analysis protocol, development of common assessments, and analyzing data. The work of the PLC will be centered around the research of Richard DuFour's PLC questions:
 1. What is it we want our scholars to learn?
 2. How will we know if each scholars have learned it?
 3. How will we respond when some scholars do not learn it?
 4. How can we extend and enrich the learning for scholar who have demonstrated proficiency?

Evidence-based Strategy: Empower AVID Cohort teachers to develop as content leaders through the use of WICOR strategies to increase instructional practice. They will co-facilitate PD sessions alongside administrators and content leaders, open classrooms for observations, and coach colleagues in effective instructional practices.

Unpacking grade level ELA standards during PLC's and annotating the text. Support and utilize formal and informal assessment strategies that inform instruction. Identity proficiency levels and implement instructional strategies to increase conceptual development of key content.

Facilitated monthly Professional Development on AVID CRT strategies to address culturally relevant instructional strategies.

Unpacking grade level Math standards during PLC's and doing the math to plan for the appropriate aspect of rigor. Support and utilize formal and informal assessment strategies that inform instruction. Identity proficiency levels and implement instructional strategies to increase conceptual development of key content.

Unpacking grade level Science standards during PLC's. Utilize Science Labs to provide an opportunity for scholars to have real-world examples as they acquire Science content.

Support and utilize formal and informal assessment strategies that inform instruction. Identify proficiency levels and implement instructional strategies to increase scholar proficiency. Implement What's the Evidence, Science Gaming, and Science Labs to solidify scholar learning.

The Equity Team will facilitate professional development through monthly meetings and/or weekly communication strategies around the Four Drivers of Equity and the Bridging the Gap Plan and how they relate to online learning.

Action planning, mentoring, and small group instruction for L25 scholars to close the achievement gap as outlined in the Bridging the Gap Plan.

Utilizing the AVID WICOR strategies will increase teacher knowledge of instructional strategies and scholar college and career readiness.

Unpacking standards will help teacher clarity and instructional practice by identifying the verbs, understanding the language of the standards, planning for higher order questions, and utilizing the level descriptors to plan for differentiated teaching and learning.

Unpacking standards and utilizing multiple formal and informal assessments (ex. Exit tickets, MFAS, and Illustrative Mathematics tasks, and student work analysis) will provide teachers with corrective instruction information to inform teaching and learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Unpacking standards and utilizing multiple formal and informal assessments (ex. Science probes, Assessments, Diagnostic, and What's the Evidence tasks, and student work analysis) will provide teachers with corrective instruction information to inform teaching and learning.

Facilitating monthly professional development around the AVID CRT will inspire teachers and families to form powerful learning partnerships to enhance student performance.

Facilitating professional development around the Three Drivers of Equity will provide a structure for reflection, courageous conversations, and adaptive change.

Increase proficiency of African-American scholars in order to close the achievement gap between black and non-black scholars as outlined in the Bridging the Gap Plan.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will attend monthly AVID professional development, side by side coaching with content leaders, and learn to collaborate and provide standards based feedback.

Continue the implementation of PBIS, Restorative Practices, scholar, and teacher celebrations (Ron Clark Academy, Three Drivers of Equity, Equity Champions)

Calendar professional development around the Three Drivers of Equity

Person Responsible Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)

Teachers will attend Standards-based professional development in ELA for teachers with a focus on equity grounded within the shifts. (ex. unpacking the standards utilizing A-Net, Standards Institute, text analysis, cognitive complexity, determining text complexity, and student work analysis)

Person Responsible Jasmine Daughtry (daughtryj@pcsb.org)

Teachers will attend Standards-based professional development in Math for teachers with a focus on progression of standards-horizontal and vertical planning looking at the major work of the grade. (ex. unpacking the standards utilizing A-Net, Standards Institute, aspects of rigor, coherence map, student work analysis)

Person Responsible Carol Hutton (huttonc@pcsb.org)

Calendar professional development around the Three Drivers of Equity

Person Responsible Tenishelah Johnson (johnsonten@pcsb.org)

Teachers will attend Standards-based professional development (ELA, Math, and Science) for teachers with a focus on equity grounded within the shifts. (ex. unpacking the standards utilizing A-Net)

Person Responsible Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)

Leadership team will meet bi-weekly with L25 scholars to monitor their bi-weekly assessments, provide strategies for building scholar efficacy, and provide small group corrective instruction.

Person Responsible Cassandra Riley (rileyc@pcsb.org)

Empower AVID Cohort teachers to develop as content leaders through the use of WICOR strategies to increase instructional practice. They will co-facilitate PD sessions alongside administrators and content leaders, open classrooms for observations, and coach colleagues in effective instructional practices.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A focus on culture and environment relating to social and emotional learning is going to promote an increase in scholar attendance, self-efficacy, family engagement and a healthy school.

Measurable Outcome: Maximo Elementary scholars will increase attendance physically and/or virtually by 5% as measured by the 2019-2020 daily average attendance rate.
 Maximo Elementary scholars will show a decrease in discipline infractions by 5% monthly as measured by FOCUS discipline data.
 Maximo Elementary families will demonstrate a 5% increase in participation in virtual family engagement activities as measured by Title I parent engagement activity sheets.
 Maximo Staff culture will increase satisfaction ratings by 5% as measured by the yearly school climate survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tekoa Moses (mosest@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using Positive Behavior Support Intervention strategies creates more efficient and effective systems to monitor attendance.
 The school will continue with the Positive Behavior Support Interventions and implement the Second Steps curriculum for the 2020-2021 school year.
 The Pinellas County Schools Family Engagement Manual uses the Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships which is a link to learning, building relationships, and develop the dual capacity for families and staff. In conjunction with this manual, Florida’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Family and Community Engagement map provides additional strategies to improve and refrained the school practice over time.
 The Benchmark of Quality yearly evaluation system of PBIS provides guidance and strategies to improve culture and climate for staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Positive Behavior Support Intervention is used because behavior and attendance often link together. Using the Tier framework helps conceptualize attendance and create an action plan for the tiers to support scholar needs. (Tier- 1 Universal all scholars: Preventives and initiatives programs 80-100% , Tier-2 Scholars at risk or rising attendance: Interventions 20% -15%, Tier-3 Chronic absence/ habitually truant: Intensive Programs(5-15%)

The Positive Behavior Support Intervention has a framework and guidance to support scholars at all tier-3 levels of support. The Second Steps will provide lessons for grades Pre-K- 5th to address social-emotional skills and techniques to help our scholars cope with and recover from extreme stress and trauma.

Research has pointed out that effective engagement activities, directly linked to core learning, and integrated within a system of learning supports, increases academic student performance. Using the MTSS Family and Community Engagement map helps the school leadership team improve implementation levels and fidelity of family and community engagement practices as well as in a coaching capacity with staff and families.

The use of the Benchmarks of Quality is a comprehensive overview of ratings to guide the team to improve staff voice and identify the necessary action steps. These steps will create

a working community where staff is valued and appreciated for the service they provide to our scholars, parents, and community.

Action Steps to Implement

Child Study Teams weekly meetings. A strategic plan is created with process and procedures including protocols outlined to monitor face-to-face and virtual attendance. The team will communicate the plan to staff, parents, and scholars as well as provide consistent updates on progression. Ongoing attendance initiatives will continue.

Weekly MTSS Behavior Meetings focused on teaching staff and scholars the behavior expectations, Staff training using cultural Responsive Strategies with quarterly PD based on the needs of school culture and discipline data. Ongoing weekly classroom management walkthroughs, feedback, coaching cycles, and identify scholars with 2 or more behavior referrals. Using Proactive behavior strategies that support scholars' needs. Communication of behavior data by monthly visual displays and other media. Ongoing behavior celebrations will continue and an adaptive plan for tier-2-&- 3 scholars will also be implemented and monitored.

Creating a family engagement team of parents and staff members that meet virtually monthly. Using existing Title 1 data to determine the next steps and develop processes, procedures, and family engagement events centered around training that link academic resources and partnerships with families and staff. Improving the school communication system to inform parents and keep them connected through media platforms. Offering parents small group training to help them learn how to use Canvas, Microsoft Teams, Zoom and district virtual learning to better help their child(ren). Providing a feedback survey to plan what parents need to help their families be successful.

The PBIS team will meet monthly to improve practice that focuses on refraining staff culture and climate. The team will establish a staff survey to get staff input and use the data to plan and disseminate. A written plan will be communicated to the staff which includes how the team will implement strategies with given dates, and how the team will monitor the effectiveness of the plan.

Person Responsible Tenishelah Johnson (johnsonten@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Through improving instructional practice (including all stakeholders) we will focus on:

Standards-based Instruction

Equitable Practices

Collaborative Planning

IPG's (Instructional Practice Guides)

K-2 Early Literacy

Real-time Coaching

Interim Assessments/Formative Assessments

Utilize A-Net to build leadership capacity for Instructional Leadership Team

With a focus on the above mentioned strategies we will increase scholar proficiency and prepare scholars for college and career positively impacting scholars with disabilities, ELA, Math, and Science proficiency.

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.

Maximo Elementary plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders through the use of Class Dojo to share positive updates, Family/Community school events, Content Nights, Conference Nights

- PTA/SAC
- Mentoring
- Community Partnerships
- Volunteer
- Digital parent support groups
- TZ Parent Ambassador Program
- Parent Recognition Program

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: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$2,300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	2281 - Maximo Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,300.00
			<i>Notes: Provide funds for stipends for teachers to attend professional development beyond the contracted day and school year.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
					Total:	\$2,300.00