Fruitville Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fruitville Elementary School

601 HONORE AVE, Sarasota, FL 34232

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/fruitville

Demographics

Principal: Steven French

Start Date for this Principal: 1/7/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	61%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

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

Fruitville Elementary School

601 HONORE AVE, Sarasota, FL 34232

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/fruitville

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 KG-5	No	51%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

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.

Fruitville Elementary wants all students to achieve at their academic potential, to love learning, to feel valued as individuals, and to develop healthy self-esteem and good citizenship in a safe environment. We also want parents and community members to feel welcomed and be an integral part of the learning environment.

Core Values

Diversity-Embracing the variety of our cultures while respecting each other and all working towards a common goal.

Belonging-Creating an environment where people from all walks of life including students, families and staff feel accepted, comfortable, safe and part of a family.

Collaborative-Working together to create an environment that respects and enhances our Fruitville community strengths while celebrating differences for success achievement for all.

Integrity-Committing to high morals, honesty and ethics even when no one is watching.

Growth mindset-Encouraging place to grow. We embrace challenges and persevere through obstacles to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To foster productive ethical students working together through respect and integrity for the greater good of all.

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
French, Steven	Principal	The role of the Admin/MTSS team at Fruitville Elementary is to analyze relevant school data for the purpose of problem analysis,intervention development, and goal setting in order to develop and implement the SIP plan. Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) guides our discussions. Each member of the team also is a grade level facilitator for the MTSS process and represents that team at weekly student SWST meetings. The Admin team is responsible for reviewing progress towards indicators on the BPIE (Best Practices in Inclusive Education) at a monthly meeting. Indicators to target include: #6 "School data reflect that all SWDs, ages 3-5, receive special education and related services in the regular early childhood (Pre-K) and kindergarten classes with peers without disabilities. #18 "Special, electives and career technical education (CTE) teachers have regularly scheduled opportunities to consult with special education teachers and related service providers to implement strategies that support the learning of all SWDs in their classes." #30 "Learning opportunities and resources are provided to families of SWDs as a result of needs assessments and student data." #31 "When communicating with families of SWDs, all personnel consider family members as a resource and obtain their input in planning and problem solving."
Spinale, Melissa	School Counselor	
Hannon, Jamie	Assistant Principal	
Portnowitz, Gina	Psychologist	
Rogers-Hehr, Christina	School Counselor	
Kramer, Kate	Teacher, K-12	
Calderin, Vivian	Other	
Cox, Kenneth	Attendance/ Social Work	
Seltzer, Jessica	Teacher, ESE	
Cummings, Stacy	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 1/7/2015, Steven French

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.*
7

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
74

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	61%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central

Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	115	135	109	120	113	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	698
Attendance below 90 percent	2	7	3	12	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	3	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/22/2020

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	149	121	132	117	116	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	754
Attendance below 90 percent	8	9	12	6	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	2	5	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	5	4	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	149	121	132	117	116	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	754
Attendance below 90 percent	8	9	12	6	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	2	5	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	5	4	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	73%	68%	57%	72%	68%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	62%	58%	60%	63%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	53%	53%	53%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	80%	73%	63%	81%	72%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	67%	62%	73%	68%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	53%	51%	67%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	65%	53%	73%	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	70%	70%	0%	58%	12%
	2018	72%	68%	4%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	67%	8%	58%	17%
	2018	74%	67%	7%	56%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	69%	68%	1%	56%	13%
	2018	75%	66%	9%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	76%	73%	3%	62%	14%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	82%	72%	10%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison	-6%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	72%	12%	64%	20%
	2018	87%	71%	16%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison	2%					
05	2019	74%	70%	4%	60%	14%
	2018	69%	72%	-3%	61%	8%
Same Grade Comparison	5%					
Cohort Comparison	-13%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	66%	65%	1%	53%	13%
	2018	73%	67%	6%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison	-7%					
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	44	48	32	58	54	44	32				
ELL	48	44	28	73	69	55	46				
BLK	48	50		46	42	27					
HSP	59	54	28	73	69	54	59				
MUL	91	90		95	90						
WHT	83	69	63	87	73	53	78				
FRL	65	62	40	74	63	48	68				
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	46	59	58	58	52	43	21				
ELL	52	68	67	72	63	50	45				
BLK	59			47							
HSP	64	64	55	74	53	48	60				
MUL	77	50		77	70						
WHT	86	69	53	87	60	58	84				
FRL	69	66	59	75	58	48	68				

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
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	41	35	39	61	55	56	37				
ELL	54	53	56	74	61	59	57				
BLK	24	33	40	38	57		58				
HSP	64	57	52	77	73	72	63				
MUL	73			82							
WHT	85	64	65	89	74	59	82				
FRL	64	54	51	75	69	70	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
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
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
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	
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	43
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	57
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	92
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	72
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.

We see the lowest performance the proficiency performance of our lowest 25th percentile in ELA (43%) and math (50%). Over the past several years we have seen stagnant or declining scores in the lowest quartile performance in both subjects in ELA and Math. The majority of these students are identified as students with a disability or ESOL students. These students require direct specially designed instruction for all academics.

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

ELA proficiency scores with our lowest quartile population declined from 55% to 43% this 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.

ELA achievement at Fruitville showed a positive gap when compared to the state. Our students performed at 73% while the state ELA average was 57%. In Math achievement, Fruitville performed at a 80% and the state average was 63%. The only area Fruitville performed below the state average was Math Lowest quartile. Fruitville scored 50% while the state average was 51%.

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

We showed the most improvement in Math learning gains we climbed from a 57% to a 70%. We provided strategic interventions for students needing to show large growth to indicate a gain. We had teachers pushing into different grade levels during their planning to support small group targeted instruction.

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

Attendance percentage below 90% is still an area of concern at all grade levels. Unfortunately, at the elementary level the majority of attendance concerns relate to parental involvement. We work closely with our truancy worker to intervene.

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

1. ELA lowest 25th percentile
2. Math lowest 25th percentile
3. ELA Learning Gain
4. ELA achievement
5. Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We saw all scores for ELA decrease this year. We noticed our current lowest quartile ELA performance was stagnant but declined by 12% this year. We are trying to push this group of students to reach achievement and show a learning gain.
Measurable Outcome:	1. By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of 4%-point increase for all students when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain on FSA ELA from 63% to 67%. 2. By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of a 4%-point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile on FSA ELA from 43% to 47%. 3. By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of a 2%-point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across 3,4 & 5) on FSA ELA from 73% to 75%. 4. By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of a 4%-point increase for students in the lowest quartile sub groups ELL (28% to 32%) , SWD (32% to 36%) and HSP (28% to 32%) demonstrating a learning gain on FSA ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jamie Hannon (jamie.hannon@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Leveled-Literacy Intervention, inclusion classrooms at all grade levels, after school tutoring
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	What Works Clearninghouse states that LLI is designed to help struggling readers meet grade-level achievement after short-term intervention. The intervention provides explicit instruction in phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, oral language skills, and writing

Action Steps to Implement

-Identify lowest quartile students who currently do not receive any additional supports.
-creation of part-time academic interventionists positions to facilitate LLI & instructional strategy groups
-Complete grade level running records K-3 to determine intervention groups
-Implement Leveled Literacy Interventions (LLI) with select students in lowest quartile
-CPT days- collaborative planning time with the administration to complete data analysis and identify student performance gaps and/or areas for acceleration. Teacher will calculate points required to show a learning gain and group students with similar needs.
-Grade 2-5 ELA professional development opportunities provided by school district to increase instructional strategies
-Purchase iXL for teachers to use. Teacher can assign standards for lower grade levels to remediate skills.

Person Responsible	Jamie Hannon (jamie.hannon@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math performance scores over the past three school years have fluctuated from year to year. Lowest quartile performance continues to be an area of concern. Our learning gains in math, however, jumped from a 57% to a 70%. Our proficiency remained the exact same at 80%.
Measurable Outcome:	1. By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of 2%-point increase for all students when 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain on FSA Math from 70% to 72%. 2. By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of a 4%-point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile on FSA Math from 50% to 54%. 3. By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of a 2%-point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across 3,4 & 5) on FSA Math from 80% to 82%. 4. By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of a 4%-point increase for students in the lowest quartile sub group BLK (27% to 31%) demonstrating a learning gain on FSA Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-creation of part-time academic interventionist to support teachers with data analysis/ instructional strategies and facilitate intervention groups with students -CPT days- time with the administration to complete data analysis and identify student performance gaps and/or areas for acceleration. Teacher will calculate points required to show a learning gain and group students with similar needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Monthly planning time, monitoring common assessments, whole-grade level data analysis leads to collective teacher efficacy (effect size 1.57). Individually targeted interventions delivered during the school day and during after school tutoring sessions lead to a positive response to intervention (effect size 1.07).

Action Steps to Implement

1. CPT data discussions with grade level teams based upon iReady standards mastery
2.identify lowest quartile and learning gain goals
3. monthly data discussion with summative assessment results
4. Group students based on needs and intervene
5. Purchase iXL for teachers to use. Teacher can assign standards for lower grade levels to remediate skills.

Person Responsible	Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science proficiency dropped from a 73% to 69% The need for science standards and vocabulary to explicitly taught is crucial to future growth.
Measurable Outcome:	By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of 4%-point increase for all students where less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across levels 3,4 & 5) on FCAT 2.0 Science from 69% to 73%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Provide time for collaboration among science teachers to share best practices. Interactive science lab fostering inquiry skills ,vocabulary and scientific method. -Schedule 5th grade students to receive an additional 15 minutes every time they attend science as a specials class (additional 380 minutes over the course of the school year) -12 of science boot camp to review science standards from grades 3-4 -STEM committee to set school-wide science calendar and with supporting activities
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Monthly planning time to monitoring district science benchmark assessments and whole-grade level data analysis lead to collective teacher efficacy (effect size 1.57).

Action Steps to Implement

1. -Participate in and monitor CPTs with teacher to analyze student performance results on curriculum based assessments and county benchmark assessments to identify gaps in student learning
2. -Instructional observations of science blocks to ensure coverage of science standards
3. Purchase the lab kits connected to new science curriculum to provide students with hands-on learning opportunities
4. Creation of STEAM class on specials rotation (an extra 25 hours of science based instruction for the year)

Person Responsible	Steven French (steven.french@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As our population shifts at Frutiville, we see a need to create a sense of community where all students, staff and families feel welcome and safe to learn. We believe students will learn if we meet them where they are and move them forward at a pace that promotes confidence in their own abilities.
Measurable Outcome:	By the year 2021, we will see a positive trend in our students' social and emotional skills as measured by the number of students displaying early warning indicators from 12% to 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jamie Hannon (jamie.hannon@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Resorative strategies (circle process), PBS school, House System (Fruitville Fleet), Mentoring program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Creating a community centered in our 5 core values will increase the following areas: teacher-student relationships (.72 effect size), Student motivation (.48 effect size), and classroom behaviors (.68 effect size).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure all staff are trained in restorative circles
2. Create schoolwide community culture (Fruitville Fleet)
3. Monitor early warning indicators
4. Target individual students with mentoring program

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team meets weekly to review current goals while monitoring new issues that arise on campus. The goal of the leadership team is to support all teachers and students. A member of the leadership team serves on all grade-level teams to facilitate discussions and problem-solving sessions. In addition, other responsibilities include facilitation of school wide initiatives (restorative circles, Fleet system, PBS, etc)

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.

Fruitville is lucky to have great parental involvement even from a distance. We utilizes the School Advisory Council, PTO, and Fruitville First MATES. group to support the mission and vision of the school. Throughout the school year, the school will present both academic and social emotional topics to keep families abreast of new initiatives and programs that would benefit their children. Mr. French keeps families connected with a Monday message which speaks to academics, operations, and school community related news items. This message is also presented on the school website, emailed to families and posted on Facebook. Connect Ed and REMIND are used to inform parents of upcoming events.

On campus, we are the Fruitville Fleet! Students will work together to develop our five core values (diversity, integrity, belonging, collaborative and growth mind set). Students and staff will be randomly sorted on to 1 of 10 ships. Each ship will be made up of students ranging from grade K through grade 5. The Fleet System promotes a keen but good-natured rivalry between ship crews to see who will win the Ship Trophy at the end of each school year. Points towards this prize will accumulate from the various academic achievements, behaviors, ship sporting events, and other friendly competitions held throughout the year.
By setting up our Fleet, we believe that strong ship loyalty and a sense of friendly competition will continue to provide opportunities for personal growth and success, as well as create a fun-filled and positive school atmosphere. This new system is part of our continued focus on whole-student success (i.e., Growth Mindset) and will encourage students to form positive relationships with fellow students at all grade levels. The purpose of each ship is to guide and support the academic, social, emotional, and personal development of each student during their time at Fruitville Elementary. The sense of "family" in each of the ships will promote a feeling of identity, belonging and of self worth.

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: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00