

Martin County School District

# Port Salerno 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# Port Salerno Elementary School

3260 SE LIONEL TER, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/pses

## Demographics

Principal: Lauren Gifford

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

<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>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (42%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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 Martin 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

## Port Salerno Elementary School

3260 SE LIONEL TER, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/pses

### 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	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	90%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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.

Port Salerno Elementary School is one big community- we work together to help each other. Teamwork achieves a better learning environment for all students by building character and motivating kids to learn.

Martin County School District mission: Educating all students for success.

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

Learning is active, fun and meaningful at Port Salerno Elementary School.

Martin County School District vision: A dynamic educational system of excellence.

### 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
Eberst, Allysa	Principal	
Gumbinner, Diane	School Counselor	
Wardle, Diane	Instructional Coach	
Gifford, Lauren	Assistant Principal	
Shaffer, David	Assistant Principal	
McKerlie, Meagan	Teacher, ESE	ESE Support Facilitator
Miles, Carolyn	School Counselor	
Bagley, Nicole	Instructional Coach	
Porter, Amy	Instructional Coach	
Florio, Maties	Teacher, K-12	
Jamison, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Lauren Gifford

**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.*

3

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

5

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

41

### 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>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (42%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* 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	107	122	131	109	162	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	732
Attendance below 90 percent	39	53	34	28	51	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	231
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	22	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

**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	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

**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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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

Tuesday 10/20/2020

**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	126	136	124	171	107	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	783
Attendance below 90 percent	19	18	11	18	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	27	45	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

**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	25	5	9	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	0	3	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

**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	126	136	124	171	107	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	783
Attendance below 90 percent	19	18	11	18	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	27	45	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

**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	25	5	9	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	0	3	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

**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	36%	58%	57%	28%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	59%	58%	47%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	56%	53%	51%	54%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	40%	65%	63%	42%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	47%	65%	62%	55%	67%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	53%	51%	46%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	26%	58%	53%	27%	55%	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	27%	54%	-27%	58%	-31%
	2018	37%	57%	-20%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	57%	-16%	58%	-17%
	2018	34%	55%	-21%	56%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	33%	55%	-22%	56%	-23%
	2018	30%	58%	-28%	55%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	33%	58%	-25%	62%	-29%
	2018	38%	63%	-25%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	67%	-19%	64%	-16%
	2018	44%	64%	-20%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	30%	64%	-34%	60%	-30%
	2018	33%	64%	-31%	61%	-28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	24%	53%	-29%	53%	-29%
	2018	18%	54%	-36%	55%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	31	33	21	39	44	36	14				
ELL	31	45	51	33	45	45	22				
BLK	21	53		31	33						
HSP	33	47	52	35	46	49	22				
WHT	62	60		70	57		53				
FRL	35	49	56	38	45	43	21				
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	33	50	42	37	38		24				
ELL	30	61	70	36	45	40	7				
BLK	8	41		24	35						
HSP	32	58	66	38	44	41	10				
MUL	36			18							
WHT	62	55		56	49	20	52				
FRL	36	56	61	40	44	38	19				
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	17	42	38	25	42	31	7				
ELL	21	50	60	39	61	50	17				
BLK	16	31		20	31						
HSP	24	49	61	41	60	50	20				
WHT	47	45		54	50		50				
FRL	27	48	51	41	56	43	27				

**ESSA Data**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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 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	60
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	41
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.**

PSE's lowest performing area was our 3rd grade English/Language Arts. 27% of our 3rd grade students scored proficient in ELA, which was 27% behind other MCSD 3rd graders, and 31% behind other Florida 3rd graders. This area was also a 10% decrease from where our 3rd grade students scored on the 2018 3rd grade ELA FSA section, although this is a different cohort of students. Some contributing factors to this low performance could be students entering 3rd grade lacking foundational skills to be successful in 3rd grade, as well as a large population of our students identified as English Language Learners. Another factor is our teachers needing continued and targeted professional

development focused on grade level standards and the FSA test item specifications, to ensure their instruction is matching the rigor the standards and the FSA.

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

PSE saw the biggest decline in our 5th grade math cohort comparison. We saw a 14% decrease in proficiency, from 45% in 4th grade to 32% in 5th grade when comparing their Math FSA. Not only did this effect their proficiency scores, this also negatively impacted their learning gains scores, only 28% of our students made math learning gains. Some contributing factors included two new teachers to the grade level, inconsistency with rigor and instruction from 4th grade to fifth grade team, and a possible factor could be the increased focus on ELA achievement.

**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.**

When comparing PSE to state averages, our biggest gap was with 3rd grade English/ Language Arts. PSE students scored 27% proficient compared to 58% of Florida 3rd graders. Last year, our students proficiency was only 20% lower when compared to the state. Again, some contributing factors to this low performance could be students entering 3rd grade lacking foundational skills to be successful in 3rd grade, as well as a large population of our students identified as English Language Learners. In addition, our teachers need more professional development with the rigor of the standards for their grade level. Although teams are more stable for the 19-20 school year, there has been previously new staff in primary/foundational grades.

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

One data component that showed the most improvement is science achievement at 26%. In 2018 PSE's science achievement was 19% as compared to the 7-point increase in 2019. New actions that were taken in 2018:

- \* updates to master schedule reflecting specific time science with an increase of instructional minutes
  - \* Made adjustments to the Science Lab on the Related Arts wheel so our lab teacher can support 5th grade students
  - \* Lab teacher is reviewing tested 3rd and 4th grade standards with students in the science lab.
  - \* Support for bubble students during the 5th grade Intervention block
  - \* Optional Pre-School Day to work on planning the integration of science themed nonfiction text that match with grade level science standards into the ELA workshop and non-fiction reading strategies.
  - \* Quarterly 5th grade planning day with focus on planning around science power standards.
  - \* Using data to differentiate based on students/class need in relation to tested/power standards.
  - \* Aligning resources to the standards and collaboratively planning activities for each unit.
  - \* Based off PMT2, teachers are going to create a Science WTS time to groups students
- Another data component that showed improvement was our math lowest quartile. In 2019 learning gains in our math lowest quartile went from 38% to 45%.
- \* identify students that need intervention support through MTSS process
  - \* Provide skill specific interventions: tier 2 and 3- strengthen PM tools

\* Within PLC's and coaching cycle, teachers will collaborate and plan for differentiated instruction

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

Looking at the Early Warning System data, our biggest area of concern is our number of retainees; in 3rd grade, we had 28 who were retained due to scoring a level 1 on the ELA FSA. We also have 20 students grade 3 - 5 who have a double retention.

Another area of concern is our student attendance, especially for our primary (K-3) students. This past year we had 18 students in 1st and 3rd grade who had less than 90% attendance, and 19 students in kindergarten with less than 90% attendance.

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. ELA Lowest Quartile Gains
3. ESSA Subgroups:SWD, ELL, Black
4. Science Achievement
5. Math Achievement

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**



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

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Areas of Focus are Nature of Science and Life Science. Data shows students in grade 5 are not measuring at the proficiency level according to Florida Statewide Science Assessment data.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By May of 2020, 40% of students will measure proficient in science as measured by the Florida Statewide Science Assessment in the domain of Nature of Science.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Matries Florio (florion@martin.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Provide students with opportunities to interact with science vocabulary, close achievement gaps, and target individual needs based on school-wide and classroom data.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Employ strategies to support the learning of content area vocabulary in classrooms. Opportunities for hands on learning will assist in increasing science proficiency.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Completion of at least one grade level common lab experiment (in accordance with CDC guidelines) per nine weeks of school. Labs will focus on Nature of Science standards as well as unit standards.
2. Grade level science rotations to review standards prior to unit assessments, as well as after assessments to remediate students based off needs identified from those assessments.
3. Use of Spanish cognates along with pictures during vocabulary instruction.
4. Utilize Elementary Science Quarterly Instructional Plans. Plans include instruction, guided practice, independent practice, assessments, and additional resources.
5. Increase science mindsets of female students through STEM programs.
6. Implement [www.floridastudents.org](http://www.floridastudents.org) science tutorials for students in grades 3-5 to complete during related arts rotation of computer lab.
7. Quarterly 5th grade planning day with focus on inquiry based projects around science power standards.
8. 5th grade students focus on 3rd and 4th power standards in the science lab to review standards that are more likely to be tested on their Science SSA.
9. Provide teachers with science professional development from the District Science Coordinator and Savvas (Pearson).
10. Utilize supports of the ESC teachers for differentiation supports with science standards in intermediate grades for the first 11 weeks of school.

**Person Responsible** Matries Florio (florion@martin.k12.fl.us)

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

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Data shows that students in grades 3-5 are not measuring at the proficiency level according to the Florida Standards Assessment data.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By May 2021, 42% of students will measure proficient in math as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment in the math domain of numbers and operations.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	David Shaffer (shaffed@martin.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Provide instruction that focuses on work through the math model of concrete to representational to the final abstract component.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Employing strategies to support the learning of content-area vocabulary in classrooms will assist in increasing mathematical proficiency over all math domains.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Increase mathematical mindsets of our Black, ELL, and ESE students through instruction shown through the concrete, representational and abstract model of instructional.
2. Provide cross grade level standard progression planning throughout school year.
3. Provide lesson study professional development to unwrap standards and plan for small group instruction.
4. Provide professional development on interactive journals and small group independent games within standards.
5. After school tutoring that supports our ELL, ESE and Black subgroups to increase mathematical mindsets for students and parents.
6. Professional development for teachers in 3 act tasks, number talks and vocabulary strategies to increase mathematical mindsets.
7. Differentiated small groups and targeted interventions to meet individual student needs.
8. Creation of math manipulative "tool kits" so students have access to utilize manipulatives to support understanding of mathematical concepts.

**Person Responsible** Meagan McKerlie (mckerlm@martin.k12.fl.us)

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

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Data shows that students in grades K-2 are not measuring at the proficiency level according to the iReady math diagnostic data in the domain of numbers and operations.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By May 2021, 55% of K-2 students will score at or above grade level in the math domain Numbers and Operations as measured by the iReady window 3 data.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	David Shaffer (shaffed@martin.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Provide instruction that focuses on work through the math model of concrete to representational to the final abstract component.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Employing strategies to support the learning of concrete-area vocabulary in classrooms will assist in increasing mathematical proficiency over all math domains.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will be provided professional development of 3 act tasks, number talks and vocabulary strategies to increase math discourse in real life strategies.
2. Professional development with iReady toolbox and MAFS books to use with number and operations lessons.
3. Intentional planning to create differentiated small groups and targeted interventions to meet individual needs.
4. Provide professional development on interactive journals and small group independent games within standards by district coaches.
5. Build fluency of facts through the use of concrete, representational and abstract for conceptual understanding of number patterns.

**Person Responsible** Meagan McKerlie (mckerlm@martin.k12.fl.us)

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

Reading Proficiency Grades K-2. Data shows that students in grades K-2 are not measuring at the proficiency level according to iReady diagnostic data.

**Measurable Outcome:** By June 2021, 50% of our students in grades K-2 will be reading on or above grade level according to the third reading iReady diagnostic assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Amy Porter (portera@martin.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Provide explicit, systematic, and multi-sensory phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, and oral language instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Our school will implement instruction and strategies that are research-based to target identified early literacy skills. Data indicates the primary grade levels have demonstrated needs in the areas of phonics and phonemic awareness. With the high population of English Language Learners across various stages of language acquisition, we are in need of more oral language instruction and exposure.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Implement Heggerty's Phonemic Awareness in grades K-2. Provide feedback on instruction and coaching support to increase the fidelity of implementation.

**Person Responsible** Amy Porter (portera@martin.k12.fl.us)

Implement Foundations phonics instruction in grades K-2. Provide feedback on instruction and coaching support to increase the fidelity of implementation.

**Person Responsible** Amy Porter (portera@martin.k12.fl.us)

Incorporate small group instruction to include guided reading and strategy lessons.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Bagley (bagleyn@martin.k12.fl.us)

Provide small group intervention support utilizing Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI) materials.

**Person Responsible** Amy Porter (portera@martin.k12.fl.us)

Utilize Imagine Learning resources for small group instruction and paraprofessional support using ACCESS 2.0 data and the "Can-do" descriptors as a guide/resource.

**Person Responsible** Amy Porter (portera@martin.k12.fl.us)

Provide Mondo small group instruction in kindergarten and first grade for our students needing extra support with oral language development. Coaches will support with identifying students, collecting data, and training staff to deliver instruction.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Bagley (bagleyn@martin.k12.fl.us)

Collaborative Data Liaison (CDL) for each grade level will support teams during Professional Learning Communities with data analysis, subgroup monitoring, and planning for rigorous, standards-based instruction.

**Person Responsible** Amy Porter (portera@martin.k12.fl.us)

Standards based, differentiated, targeted, student data-driven instruction during additional ELA time.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Bagley (bagleyn@martin.k12.fl.us)

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

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Reading proficiency Grades 3-5. Data shows that only 33% of students in grades 3-5 are measuring at the proficiency level according to the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in 2019.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By June 2021, 40% of our students in grades 3-5 will score proficient on the Florida Standards Assessment FSA).
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Amy Porter (portera@martin.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Provide explicit, systematic, and multi-sensory phonics, vocabulary, and oral language instruction. Students will engage in reading, talking, and writing about texts across content areas.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Data indicates that the intermediate grade levels have demonstrated needs in the areas of English Language Acquisition, Phonics, Vocabulary, and Comprehension.
<b>Action Steps to Implement</b>	
Implement Foundations phonics instruction in grade 3. Provide feedback on instruction and coaching support to increase the fidelity of implementation.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Amy Porter (portera@martin.k12.fl.us)
Implement Phonics for Reading instruction in grade 4.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Nicole Bagley (bagleyn@martin.k12.fl.us)
Incorporate small group instruction to include guided reading and strategy lessons.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Amy Porter (portera@martin.k12.fl.us)
Provide small group intervention with coaching support utilizing Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI) materials.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Nicole Bagley (bagleyn@martin.k12.fl.us)
Collaborative Data Liaison (CDL) for each grade level will support teams during Professional Learning Communities with data analysis, test item specs, subgroup monitoring, and planning for rigorous, standards-based instruction.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Amy Porter (portera@martin.k12.fl.us)
Differentiated, targeted, student data-driven instruction during additional ELA time.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Nicole Bagley (bagleyn@martin.k12.fl.us)
Two full-time Literacy Coaches to support teachers and their reading instruction.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Amy Porter (portera@martin.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**PD regarding ESSA subgroups**

**Schoolwide Look- for schedule and learning walks**

**Grade level data analysis**

**Collaborative Data Liaisons**

**PLC's data driven focus/the 4 questions**

**Collaboration with district supports for brainstorming language supports- with MTSS leads, school psychologist, title 1 department**

**Remote Learning Grant/partnership with the Pew Foundation**

**Utilizing district math coach for standards based PD with small group instruction focus for**

**Remote Learners**

**After school clubs to support oral language needs**

## 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.

Establishing and maintaining a positive school culture and environment is priority to engage all stakeholders. The following are initiatives:

AVID planning year

Hello Ambassadors

Character Counts

Parent Resource Center

Leadership Marty County visit

PBIS

Student of the Month

Staff MVP

Staff book study

Invitations to district staff and school board to school events

Parent Coffees/Lunch and Learns

Celebration of Learning

Use of Social media platforms

Virtual Family nights/informational sessions

Hispanic Heritage month long celebrations and showcases

Social/Emotional Community Building Circles\

Community partnership with Americorps

**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.**

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science</b>				<b>\$4,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: After-School Club for ESSA subgroup that focuses on basic science skills that can be taught through babysitting strategies.</i>			
			0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	General Fund		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Science supplies for grade levels to support and increase of hands on science lessons (aligned to grade level standards)</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>				<b>\$3,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Professional development for teachers and programming and resources that support students with number and operations.</i>			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>				<b>\$500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Number lines to support number and operations concepts in K-2.</i>			
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>				<b>\$11,946.32</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	Other		\$2,646.24
			<i>Notes: Materials for remote learners; flashcard, bookmarks, Magnet letters, wipeboards, composition books, pencils, and sticky notes.</i>			
			0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$8,300.08
			<i>Notes: Fountas &amp; Pinnell Shared Reading Materials</i>			
			0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Reading intervention materials that support the lowest quartile during tiered intervention - focus on phonics and phonological awareness.</i>			



<b>5</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>				<b>\$24,823.50</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		120-Classroom Teachers	0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School			\$12,694.50
			<i>Notes: Fountas and Pinnell Classroom Guided Reading Collection, Grade 4</i>			
		120-Classroom Teachers	0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School			\$8,000.00
			<i>Notes: Two Grade 5 Below Benchmark Classroom Libraries</i>			
			0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School			\$4,129.00
			<i>Notes: Leveled Literacy Interventions LLI Green Kit and Blue colored books</i>			
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$44,269.82</b>