

Sarasota County Schools

# Southside Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Southside Elementary School

1901 WEBBER ST, Sarasota, FL 34239

[www.sarasotacountyschools.net/southside](http://www.sarasotacountyschools.net/southside)

## Demographics

**Principal: Jamie Hannon**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (70%)
<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 Sarasota County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Southside Elementary School

1901 WEBBER ST, Sarasota, FL 34239

[www.sarasotacountyschools.net/southside](http://www.sarasotacountyschools.net/southside)

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>24%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>24%</p>

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota 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.**

To use data-driven instruction for progress monitoring, so that each student is learning, succeeding and reaching above and beyond their potential every day.

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

To learn, to dream, to laugh, to love every child every day - whatever it takes! (Planting a seed of inspiration in every child.)

### 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
Nzeza, Jennifer	Principal	The Principal of Southside Elementary School serves as the instructional leader for the school, which includes creating a leadership team comprised of teachers representing each grade level and department within the school. The team meets each week to discuss academic and procedural topics, implement the SIP, and facilitate PBS/Rtl. Additionally, the principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing Rtl; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation and makes sure adequate professional development is offered to support Rtl implementation. The principal communicates with parents on a regular basis and oversees building operational decisions. The Principal also serves as the instructional leader for the administrative team which meets regularly to discuss academic and procedural topics.
West , Carol	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents First Grade on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Miller, Kent	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal works directly with the principal to provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making; ensure that the school-based team is implementing Rtl; ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation to make sure adequate professional development is offered to support Rtl implementation; communicate with parents regarding school based Rtl plans and activities, and oversee building operational decisions. The Assistant Principal also serves as an instructional leader on the leadership team, which meets weekly to discuss academic and procedural topics.
DeNegris, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents Third Grade on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Stewart, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents Second Grade on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).</p>
Buffaloe, Krista	Teacher, K-12	<p>General Education Teacher - Represents Kindergarten on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).</p>
Alba, Lorri	Teacher, K-12	<p>General Education Teacher - Represents Specials Teachers on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).</p>
Lugannani, Kim	School Counselor	<p>The Guidance Counselor serves on the School Leadership Team. The School Leadership Team meets weekly with the Principal and Assistant Principal to discuss academic and procedural topics, implement the SIP plan, and facilitate PBS/Rtl as a related, but distinct process from the CARE (Children at Risk in Education) eligibility determination process. Every member of the team has an equal voice and decisions are made through consensus and data driven decision making.</p>
Casanas, Katie	Teacher, K-12	<p>General Education Teacher - Represents 5th on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Melderis, Sadie	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher - Represents 4th grade on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Wiemken, Ashley	Teacher, ESE	ESE Teacher - K-4 Represents our ESE staff on the School Leadership Team to discuss academic and procedural topics as they relate to our ESE population: provides information about supporting core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Friday 6/1/2018, Jamie Hannon

**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.*

4

**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.*

11

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

37

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (70%)
<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	115	96	122	117	127	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	677
Attendance below 90 percent	1	5	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

**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	1	0	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 9/14/2020

**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	98	136	112	131	116	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	694
Attendance below 90 percent	1	9	13	8	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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

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

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

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

**Prior Year - Updated**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	98	136	112	131	116	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	694
Attendance below 90 percent	1	9	13	8	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

**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	1	0	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	83%	68%	57%	88%	68%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	62%	58%	75%	63%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	53%	53%	68%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	88%	73%	63%	87%	72%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	67%	62%	80%	68%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	53%	51%	75%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	79%	65%	53%	85%	64%	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	82%	70%	12%	58%	24%
	2018	94%	68%	26%	57%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	92%	67%	25%	58%	34%
	2018	84%	67%	17%	56%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	79%	68%	11%	56%	23%
	2018	81%	66%	15%	55%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	88%	73%	15%	62%	26%
	2018	86%	72%	14%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	72%	17%	64%	25%
	2018	83%	71%	12%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	88%	70%	18%	60%	28%
	2018	81%	72%	9%	61%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	78%	65%	13%	53%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	79%	67%	12%	55%	24%
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	42	46	39	44	58	62	23				
ELL	47			79							
HSP	73	56		83	81		65				
MUL	77	57		91	71		73				
WHT	87	71	64	89	81	65	84				
FRL	78	64	60	84	76	74	54				
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	45	27	15	45	27	15	35				
ELL	75			67							
HSP	72	54	38	76	56	53	67				
MUL	91	53		86	74						
WHT	87	69	51	85	60	41	81				
FRL	75	55	41	77	61	43	68				
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	50	57	57	47	71	75	75				
ELL	75	70		81	80						
HSP	77	69	73	77	81	77	70				
MUL	96	87		93	87						
WHT	89	76	66	89	80	78	86				
FRL	83	65	60	80	71	57	78				

### ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	610
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
----------------------	--

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	68
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Native American Students</b>	
---------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Asian Students</b>	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	72
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	74
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	77
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	71
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.**

English Language Arts Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% - This is not a trend from 2018 because we saw a 15% gain in this area. However, some of the contributing factors have been the fact that historically our Students With Disabilities have performed below the other subgroups. We believe this is due to the pull out model previously used at Southside for this subgroup.

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

Overall English Language Arts Achievement showed the greatest decline. As a school there was a 2% decline from 2018 data to the 2019 data. This is due to a significant decline in our 3rd grade ELA performance (a 12% drop in proficiency). We believe that the make-up of the 3rd grade student body related to behavior, class size, and need for additional academic and social support led to the decline. In addition, within that, our ELL subgroup performance declined from 75% to 47% proficiency.

**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.**

We are happy to report that we are above the state average in every data component.

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

The Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% is the area where we saw the most improvement. We believe we saw great gains here due to the professional development offered by our district math specialists and the implementation of the PD in classrooms. In addition, our teachers conducted a closer analysis of iReady data as well as Standards Mastery data to target their math instruction. Through collaborative planning, teachers made executive decisions related to the sequencing of curriculum which ultimately benefited students.

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

One area of concern is the number of students that previously scored a Level 1 on state assessments (3rd - 5, 4th - 4, and 5th - 4 for a total of 13 students).

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

1. Increasing the overall performance of Students With Disabilities
2. Increasing the overall performance of our ELL students
3. Enhancing opportunities and outlets as well as developing the depth and breadth of Science exposure and experiences to students K-5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction****Area of****Focus**

Increasing the overall performance of Students With Disabilities

**Description and**

Even though this subgroup of students made gains from the previous school year, they performed the lowest in all school grade components in comparison to their peers.

**Rationale:****Measurable****Outcome:**

A 10 point increase in English Language Arts learning gains (46 to 56) and learning gains for the lowest 25% (39 to 49).

**Person****responsible****for****monitoring****outcome:**

Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Evidence-****based****Strategy:**

Targeted, small-group instruction based on data analysis using the inclusion model.

**Rationale****for****Evidence-****based****Strategy:**

This model for ESE instruction was implemented on a smaller scale in 2018-2019 based on nation-wide research on its effectiveness. We saw benefits for our students as the teacher and ESE teacher worked together versus in isolation. Teacher feedback on the model was positive. As such, this year an ESE inclusion model was implemented school wide. We did this because the achievement level of our Students With Disabilities is not on par with their peers. We used data analysis of FSA, iReady, and classroom assessments and anecdotes to make this determination.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Design a master schedule to provide inclusion support required for the model.
2. Allow flexible classroom design to accommodate small groups needed for the model.
3. Provide resources and personnel to support reading and math instruction.
4. Observations and follow-up meeting regarding the success of implementation.

**Person****Responsible**

Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Increasing the overall performance on Science FCAT by developing the depth and breadth of Science exposure and experiences to students K-5. For three out of the last four assessment years our Science FCAT scores have been below 80% proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:** A 2 point increase in Science scores – from 79% to 81%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jennifer Nzeza (jennifer.nzeza@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Infuse science vocabulary throughout the curriculum, increase the number of students participating in the STEM fair, and requiring scientific investigation by exposing student the scientific method beginning in grade K.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The rationale for selecting this strategy is mostly flat Science FCAT scores. We used FCAT scores from the last four years.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Introduce K-1 students to the scientific method and complete a full scientific investigation of various topics during science wheel.
2. Conduct experiments with K-2 grade students and complete a journal, graph, and project through TEAMS in both Science Lab and Technology class on our wheel.
3. 3rd through 5th grade students will have the option to complete science projects and those classes that do will participate in the school-wide and district STEM Fair.
4. Purchase Science materials for grades K-5 to support our Elevate Science curriculum - Mystery Science.
5. Offer Science training with Cherie Dame as needed.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Daughtry (amanda.daughtry@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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

**Area of Focus** Increasing the overall performance of our ELLs.  
**Description and Rationale:** This subgroup of students did not make gains from the previous school year - in 2019, 47% were proficient compared to 2018, where 75% were proficient. They were the lowest performing group of our subgroups.

**Measurable Outcome:** A 10 point increase in English Language Arts learning gains for our ELL students - from 47% to 57%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Michele Miller (michele.miller@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Targeted, small-group instruction for ELLs based on data analysis.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Small group instruction based on the available data can improve the overall scores of our lowest learners. We have an ESOL Liaison and ESOL Aide who can assist the classroom teacher in pulling small groups to enhance instruction based on the data. We are using the significant drop in our ELL subgroup scores to make this determination.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Data tracking using iReady and either BAS, DRA, or Pioneer Valley Digital Leveled reading assessment.
2. Design a master schedule to allow for access to ELL students.
3. Provide resources and personnel to small-group instruction.
4. Progress monitor quarterly through grades, teacher feedback, and applicable data
5. Share progress with administration.

**Person Responsible** Michele Miller (michele.miller@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**We will address the remaining school-wide improvement priorities as we have done in 2019-2020.**

**We will:**

1. Use iReady to determine instructional priorities.
2. Provide Intensive ELA FSA preparation for 3rd-5th grade (and hopefully add math).
3. Use ongoing observations, data analysis, and feedback from classroom teachers.

**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.

Programs and practices to ensure a positive school culture and environment include our behavior management systems. All teachers use CHAMPS to clearly define expectations for classroom activities, transitions, and collaboration. In addition, we have a school-wide ROAR expectations. Students can earn "positive paws" for adhering to ROAR expectations anywhere on campus and from anyone - not just their classroom teacher. The positive paw shout outs are given on the morning news and are sent home. In addition, those are tracked. Students receive incentives based on the number of positive paws they receive.

Next, we have a school-wide Cultural Diversity Initiative integrating multicultural literature and activities. Each month focuses on a different culture. This connects with our overall philosophy of integrating the arts into everything we do. Classrooms create artistic pieces related to the materials they are reading.

Counselors provide small group counseling in areas such as: anger management, divorce, and grief and loss. Students are pulled individually or in small groups. Classroom Guidance lessons are provided.

Our Reading Partner program fosters positive relationships between students and adults while focusing on developing reading skills and strategies.

At Southside we have many opportunities for stakeholders to participate. For parents and staff, this includes membership and participation in our Parent Teacher Organization, Southside Foundation for the Arts, Father's Being Involved, and School Advisory Council. Our staff also has an opportunity to collaborate and discuss school issues and concerns during Collaborative Planning Time and with administration during our Team Leader meetings.

Students can positively affect our campus climate include participation in the Student Council, Safety Patrol, After School Clubs, and Theater Production.

Southside provides Parent and Family Engagement materials and trainings designed to provide assistance to parents and families in understanding challenging State academic standards, State and local academic assessments, how to monitor a child's progress, and how to work with educators to improve the achievement of their children at convenient, flexible times such as mornings and evenings as well as at-home/attendance zone visits to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students. Additionally, technology including social media and virtual meeting programs (Zoom, Teams, etc.) promote participation and awareness through live and recorded sessions to accommodate varying schedules. In addition, the district and school website contain links, resources, and materials, such as parent guides, study guides, practice assessments, student performance materials, and training to help parents and families work with their children to improve achievement.

The full text and summary of this Schoolwide Improvement Plan may be found online or as a hard copy by

request.

Parent and families are regularly invited to attend our SAC meetings to formulate suggestions and to participate, as appropriate, in decisions relating to the education of their children. Southside responds to any such suggestions as soon as practicably possible as evidenced by meeting minutes and notes. If this school-wide improvement plan is not satisfactory to parents, parents/families are encouraged to submit such comments in writing so that the school can document and submit any parents' comments.

**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	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>