

Pinellas County Schools

Mcmullen Booth Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 31 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 32 |

McMullen Booth Elementary School

3025 UNION ST, Clearwater, FL 33759

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

Demographics

Principal: Stephanie Whitaker

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2020-21 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (52%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 32 |

McMullen Booth Elementary School

3025 UNION ST, Clearwater, FL 33759

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 96% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 58% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | B | B | C |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of McMullen-Booth Elementary School is to work together to meet the needs of each and every student through rigorous and relational opportunities that will ensure their highest academic achievement and support our students as leaders of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Whitaker, Stephanie | Principal | Serve as the instructional leader of the school, observe instruction to ensure that each and every student has access to rigorous, standards based curriculum, and provide coaching and feedback to teachers and staff to move instruction forward. |
| Ekstrom, Christine | Assistant Principal | Serve as an instructional leader of the school, observe instruction to ensure that each and every student has access to rigorous, standards based curriculum, and provide coaching and feedback to teachers and staff to move instruction forward. |
| Fish, Stacey | School Counselor | Facilitate Social Emotional components of school improvement plan. |
| Garcia, Nicole | Other | Monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports, monitor progress being made by students, and facilitate PLC's to ensure that students are receiving interventions to their targeted skills needed. |
| Peters, Stacey | Behavior Specialist | Help in maintaining the positive culture and environment through the implementation of the Tier 1-Tier 3 behavior systems |
| McClister, Nicole | Teacher, ESE | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/12/2020, Stephanie Whitaker

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

2

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

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

499

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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 | 56 | 74 | 71 | 72 | 72 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 419 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 13 | 20 | 22 | 23 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 11 | 13 | 20 | 15 | 16 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |

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 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 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

Wednesday 6/30/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 46 | 80 | 77 | 80 | 83 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 449 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 29 | 17 | 10 | 18 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |

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 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - 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 | 46 | 80 | 77 | 80 | 83 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 449 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 29 | 17 | 10 | 18 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |

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 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 47% | 54% | 57% | 39% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 58% | 59% | 58% | 36% | 47% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 52% | 54% | 53% | 43% | 40% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 57% | 61% | 63% | 58% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 62% | 61% | 62% | 51% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 46% | 48% | 51% | 30% | 42% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 54% | 53% | 53% | 47% | 57% | 55% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 56% | -7% | 58% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 38% | 56% | -18% | 58% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 54% | -2% | 56% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -38% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 48% | 62% | -14% | 62% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 64% | 0% | 64% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -48% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 60% | -3% | 60% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -64% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 54% | -1% | 53% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

1st-5th Math- MAP

1st-5th ELA- MAP

5th Grade Science- District Cycle Assessments

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 63 | 53 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 49 | 53 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 51 | 56 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 60 | 63 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 52 | 53 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 48 | 58 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 0 |
| | | | | |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 54 | 47 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 43 | 29 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 0 |
| | | | | |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 29 | 33 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 23 | 34 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 73 | 75 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 26 | 36 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 73 | 73 | 0 |
| | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 23 | 25 | | 18 | 30 | 30 | 5 | | | | |
| ELL | 37 | 35 | | 46 | 48 | | 45 | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | | | 27 | 30 | | 18 | | | | |
| HSP | 37 | 38 | 50 | 45 | 47 | | 48 | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 37 | | 47 | 37 | | 39 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 40 | 44 | 41 | 46 | 42 | 48 | | | | |
| 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 | 28 | 47 | 46 | 34 | 47 | 42 | 43 | | | | |
| ELL | 43 | 53 | 50 | 60 | 67 | 44 | 50 | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 48 | 42 | 30 | 50 | 45 | 31 | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | 55 | 48 | 57 | 62 | 45 | 43 | | | | |

| 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 |
| MUL | 56 | 67 | | 50 | 80 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 62 | 62 | 65 | 64 | 47 | 71 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 61 | 58 | 53 | 61 | 49 | 51 | | | | |
| 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 | 22 | 35 | 38 | 44 | 41 | 22 | 31 | | | | |
| ELL | 24 | 51 | 58 | 51 | 50 | 45 | 35 | | | | |
| BLK | 18 | 9 | 20 | 33 | 22 | 9 | 33 | | | | |
| HSP | 27 | 44 | 50 | 50 | 52 | 44 | 44 | | | | |
| MUL | 42 | 20 | | 47 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 34 | 40 | 70 | 58 | 29 | 52 | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 36 | 40 | 54 | 45 | 27 | 39 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 55 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 351 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 96% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 23 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 44 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |

| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 27 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 45 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 43 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 46 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Historically we see Third Grade maintaining scores between 55% and 65% proficiency, including MAP and FSA scores and then year after year, fourth grade is unable to maintain not only the proficiency, but they are unable to see the growth needed. Fifth grade does not see the same decline. Historically they are able to maintain the year's worth of growth. The students do not typically regain their proficiency, but are able to maintain the track they are in and do not see the decline that was seen in fourth grade.

It is also worth noting that last year's kindergarten was one of the lowest proficiency rates that has entered kindergarten in four years. This will be a cluster of students we will need to monitor and intentionally plan as we look at our use of resources and acceleration of learning.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

A considerable amount of attention needs to be given to fourth grade both ELA and mathematics. We also need to see improvement in our Black ESSA subgroup across all subject areas.

Mathematics across the school, as consistent with what was seen throughout the district continues to be an area of concern that we will need to see improvement on over the course of the upcoming school year.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

In fourth grade mathematics, inconsistent implementation of standards based instruction due to unfamiliarity with the standard limitations.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Both 2nd and 3rd grades showed positive data trends in ELA.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Prior to this school year, there were many different initiatives being put into place, which led to a professional learning plan across the school that was spread too thin and was prohibiting the staff from putting in the time needed to collaborate and focus on standards based planning. By focusing on standards based collaboration grades 1, 2, 3, and 5 were able to see growth from fall to winter MAP.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

A streamlined process for collaborative planning and PLC work, which will be in part facilitated by the addition of an MTSS coach. Differentiated approaches to professional development across grade level and within grade levels, as we are seeing a time where teachers are seasoned in their careers and at the other end of the spectrum half of all teams except for first are within their first 3 years of their teaching careers.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

An intentional and focused PLC schedule, planned in collaboration with district coaches in each of the content areas focusing on the needs of the grade level, teachers and students. This will include, but not limited to mathematics: planning for rigorous tasks, implementing tasks, analyzing student responses and planning for next steps. Coaching/feedback cycle related to this process. ELA: Focus on implementation of formative writing tasks mid module, analysis of formative tasks and planning for next steps. Science: strategies for incorporating previously taught standards.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Professional development of team leaders, focused on the intentional planning of weekly PLC's and building capacity for doing the work in each of the content areas as specified during team leaders meetings. Eventually moving towards identifying individual needs of the grade level and planning PLC's independently and targeting needs of students and the needs of the teachers on the grade level in order to meet the student need.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | After analyzing both the cycle assessment data and the diagnostic 3rd/4th grade assessment data used in fifth grade, it was observed that on the diagnostic checkpoints our 5th grade students entered with a rate of 42.3% proficiency on tested 3rd and 4th grade standards and overall were 73% proficient on the cycle 1 district assessment. The diagnostic assessment was relative to like schools in our district with similar student demographics and school grades. By the mid-year diagnostic, while our overall rate of proficiency was 57.9% it was significantly lower than like schools by 15% on average. The cycle 2 proficiency rate was 75%. It is not unlikely that 15% more of our students should be proficient on 3rd and 4th grade science standards by the mid-year diagnostic check point. |
| Measurable Outcome: | By developing, implementing, and monitoring a comprehensive, data driven 5th grade standards review plan, using the 3rd and 4th grade Fall Diagnostic Assessment and monitoring for consistent and effective instruction that promotes student centered with rigor for all science labs, grades 1-5, 5th grades scores on the mid year diagnostic assessment will see an increase of 15%, which would be equal to 75% proficiency on 3rd and 4th grade tested standards. The overall proficiency as measured on the SSA will increase from 43% to 55% in 2022 as measured by the SSA. |
| Monitoring: | *Action plan will be turned into administration 2 weeks after the close of the August Diagnostic assessment. *Formative checks will be created and monitored by administration. *Lesson plan monitoring to ensure that teachers are implementing review sessions as defined in the review plan. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Develop, implement, and monitor a data-driven 5th grade standards review plan, using the 3rd and 4th grade Fall Diagnostic Assessment and revise after data analysis of the Spring Mock SSA. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | After analyzing both our unit assessments and diagnostic assessments given in 5th grade, we saw the greatest gap in our mid-year diagnostic data when compared to like schools. Like schools had comparable beginning of the year diagnostic data, but by the mid year diagnostic assessment, their fifth grade students were scoring 15% on average higher than our fifth grade students. By developing and implementing a standards based review plan, we would expect to see our scores also rise by 15%. Our cycle assessments are typically showing students at or around 75%, which if our mid year diagnostic could increase by 15% than our mid year diagnostic would then also be at 75%. |

Action Steps to Implement

After giving the first diagnostic assessment in August of 2022, work with 5th grade PLC to identify standards with greatest need and develop a standards based review plan utilizing resources identified as high yields from the science department. Agree upon a calendar for review and identify formative checks to use monthly to assess standards that were reviewed.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Monitor the implementation of standards based review by reviewing lesson plans and analyzing monthly data collected from formative assessments.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Continue the monthly implementation review cycle until mid year diagnostic assessment.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After moving the science lab location in the spring of 2020, the school went completely virtual with the rest of the county. Upon returning to school in August of 2020, science lab was not utilized because of COVID restrictions and teacher comfort level of sharing materials with different cohorts. Science lab was never fully relocated and materials were in between labs until this summer. 6/13 teachers in grade 3-5 are either switching grade levels, going from teaming to self-contained or switched during the previous year, during the covid restrictions, and have not used the science lab, making this a relevant goal for the upcoming school year.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2021-2022 school year, grades 1-5 will visit the science lab, as appropriate for their grade level, completing designated grade level labs. 100% of the classrooms will complete pre/post test assessments for their grade level labs throughout the school year.

Monitoring: Science lab usage and assessment calendar will be created and assessments will be monitored using performance matters.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Monitor for consistent and effective instruction that promotes student-centered with rigor for all science labs grades 1-5, as well as appropriate grade level utilization of science labs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In alignment with our district strategic plan, every elementary school should have a fully functioning science lab that is being monitored and utilized. In order for this to happen with fidelity, it is imperative that we develop a plan for ensuring that grade levels understand their science labs, that students have access to these labs, as some standards are only taught through science lab lessons and that we are monitoring student growth through the usage of pre and post assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Create appropriate grade level Science lab usage and assessment calendar.

Person Responsible Christine Ekstrom (ekstromc@pcsb.org)

Monitor usage and implementation of labs/assessments. Walk through science lab weekly for each designated lab and monitor data input on performance matters.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Develop individual plans with teachers who are not consistently using the science lab.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

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

1. The current level of proficiency is ____ as measured by the spring Mathematics FSA administered in Spring 2021.
2. Projected proficiency as measured by MAP mathematics assessment in the winter of 20/21 was 40%.
3. Inconsistent performance across cohorts, with historic implications of this pattern, consistent over a 3 year period.
4. Both SWD and Black ESSA subgroups see the most significant gaps in the area of mathematics proficiency.
4. The inconsistent proficiency achievement is occurring because of teachers not receiving the feedback and individualized coaching they need in order to grow their mathematical practice.
5. With an individualized approach to teacher professional development/and an individualized approach to the coaching feedback cycle mathematics proficiency as measured by Winter Map will increase by 20%.

Measurable Outcome:

While implementing a differentiated professional development and feedback/coaching cycle projected proficiency in grades 3-5 will increase from 40% projected proficiency in winter map 2021 60 % projected proficiency as measured during winter map of 2022.

Proficiency as measured in grades 3-5 on FSA mathematics will increase to ____ from a proficiency of 60 % in the spring of 2021.

Monitoring:

The mathematics goal will be monitored and reviewed monthly for progress in the coaching and feedback cycles during a pre-identified review schedule and will be monitored using both a combination of district created unit assessments, teacher assessments and projected math proficiency and percentage of students at or above the 50th percentile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Implement a differentiated plan to improve mathematics teacher quality. Incorporate a school-wide, grade level, and individualized training and support system.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

When looking at our teams, the needs of each teacher and grade level is at a point where the needs are varied for the upcoming school year. In our fifth grade, for the first time in five + years, the team is completely self-contained classrooms, with varying levels of experience in the area of mathematics. In our fourth grade, we have a combination of self-contained teacher and one set of teaming teachers, making the needs of the self-contained teacher very different from that of the teaming teacher. This is also due to the fact that the self-contained teacher has not had to be self-contained in 8 years and was teaching the ELA half of the block previous before the lost unit. These patterns are consistent in kindergarten and 2-5. We also see data in our fourth grade which takes a considerable dip and this has been a historical pattern.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor the flow of the math block in every class, at least weekly, by examining the role and purpose of the different points of the math block to include transitions/warm-up, core instruction, practice, and intervention/enrichment. Rate levels of need based on grade level, individual teacher need.

Person Responsible

Christine Ekstrom (ekstromc@pcsb.org)

Work with individual teachers and grade levels to develop support plans based on data collected from the flow of the mathematics blocks during each unit. Work with grade levels to develop PLC professional development plan and collaborative planning cycle to support critical needs of mathematics block.

Person Responsible Christine Ekstrom (ekstromc@pcsb.org)

Utilize MAP assessment data to drive the differentiated plan for individualized support of both students and teachers. Identify and implement unit and formative assessment between units to continue to monitor the effectiveness of the feedback cycle on student proficiency.

Person Responsible Christine Ekstrom (ekstromc@pcsb.org)

Monitor PLC notes, implementation of supports provided from walk through observations during monthly goal analysis, implementing different approaches and adjusting based on data and observed teacher need.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>1. Proficiency as measured by the 2021 FSA ELA was 46% (47% in the spring of 2019)</p> <p>2. Projected proficiency on the ELA map measured in winter of 2021 was 44%.</p> <p>3. Changes in teaching models in grades 3-5 put teachers in situations where they may be teaching ELA for the first time in a number of years and changes in units mean that some teachers are responsible for a larger percentage of the grade levels ELA proficiency scores.</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: | <p>By implementing a differentiated approach to professional development and the coaching/feedback cycle overall proficiency as measured by the FSA ELA will increase from 46% (47% in spring of 2019) to 60% in the spring of 2022. Projected proficiency as measured by Winter MAP for grades 3-5 will increase from 44% to 55% by the Winter of 2022.</p> |
| Monitoring: | <p>Coaching/feedback will be debriefed at pre-determined monthly leadership meeting to plan grade level, individual and school wide next steps.</p> <p>Student data will be monitored monthly through the analysis of formative checks as identified in the modules and debriefed at individual teacher data chats to determine next steps for individual students.</p> <p>Evidence of strategies presented in PLC's and during school wide and individual coaching will be monitored through walk through data and debriefed with grade/school/individual teachers.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Monitor instruction in the ELA block to ensure instruction in both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to research-based principles and develop individualized and differentiated professional development plans for grade levels and teachers to ensure that each teacher is receiving the coaching and feedback they need to meet the individual needs of the students in their classroom.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>When looking at our teams, the needs of each teacher and grade level is at a point where the needs are varied for the upcoming school year. In our fifth grade, for the first time in five + years, the team is completely self-contained classrooms, with varying levels of experience in the area of ELA. In our fourth grade, we have a combination of self-contained teacher and one set of teaming teachers, making the needs of the self-contained teacher very different from that of the teaming teacher. Making one teacher responsible for 2/3 of the grade levels ELA proficiency. These patterns are consistent k-5. We also see data in our fourth grade which takes a considerable dip and this has been a historical pattern which needs to be monitored closely to better understand how to best support this grade level and reverse the historical patterns that have been taking place.</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct individual data chats in August, identifying the needs of the students as they ended the previous school year, identifying students coming with no data so we can determine initial needs and start the year much more rapidly so that we see accurate data in September 2021 MAP scores.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Provide support and feedback focused on explicit, systematic and sequential approaches to reading instruction including a gradual release of responsibility model of instruction.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, EL supports as well as extensions for students above benchmarks.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Ensure that students are engaged in immense amounts of reading, discussion and writing with feedback that is high quality and that students have the opportunity to practice and use that feedback.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Observe and analyze data collected through scheduled walk throughs and develop individualized coaching and feedback cycles based on teacher need and student needs collected through formative data and observed actions during the ELA block.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

1. Completely new administration over the course of the last year.
2. Following a year where families were not invited on campus because of the health needs of the community.
3. A new bilingual associate has joined the school in the last year.
4. 7 new teachers have joined the McMullen Booth Staff since the families were last on campus.
5. Because of the changing dynamics of parent involvement over the course of the pandemic and the changes that have occurred within the makeup of the school campus, intentional and deliberate efforts need to be made in order to maintain awareness of the needs of our families, develop and maintain trust on this side of the change, and encourage participation with families, demonstrating that we are aware of the unique needs of our families.

Measurable Outcome:

By creating well planned/informative and engaging events that partner with our PTA and teachers, family relationships will be strengthened and their level of understanding of the goals of our school, for their students, and of title 1 will be increased by an increase of in participation of families in the Title 1 survey.

Monitoring:

Monitoring of families participating in face to face events, engagement with online portions of events through social media platforms, and participation in the Title 1 Survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Establish meaningful communication with families and a parent involvement plan that is carried out in family home languages, that demonstrates an awareness of the unique needs of our families and create events that demonstrate an awareness of the needs of the families, is sustained over time and is responsive to the needs of our families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Considering the above factors in the rationale for identifying this critical need, it could be expected that the trust that families had in the school prior to this school year needs to be rebuilt. Families need to be reassured that the needs of their families are understood by the new administration and evolving staff since they were last on campus for family and curriculum events.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize all forms of school communication tools to disseminate information to families in both English and Spanish. Reimplement the monthly school newsletter and revamp the Parent information Center and online parent information center.

Person Responsible

Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Include opportunities for parent outreach at all school and PTA sponsored events with the incorporation of digital resources and QR codes to give families extended access to school and classroom information.

Person Responsible

Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Work in collaboration between the school and PTA to co-sponsor events that are well planned and engaging for families.

Person Responsible

Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Work with teachers during 1 on 1 data chats to develop outreach strategies specific to the unique needs in their classrooms.

**Person
Responsible** [no one identified]

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>1. Our current level of proficiency is 33% (32.4% in the year 2019) as measured by the 2021 Spring FSA ELA results.</p> <p>2. Our current level of proficiency is 27% (30% in the ear 2019) as measured by the 2021 Spring FS mathematics assessment.</p> <p>3. Our Black ESSA subgroup was below 40% during the 2019 testing cycle and is anticipated to continue in this pattern.</p> <p>4. Continued need for PD related to culturally responsive/equitable teaching practices.</p> <p>5. Continued evolution of our school wide Houses system, specifically related to the needs of students in the Black ESSA subgroup.</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: | By incorporating strategies relevant to our houses system, gamification from our Boy's gender study, and culturally relevant teaching practices specifically targeting the learning needs of black students to accelerate the learning, our level of performance in both reading proficiency and mathematics proficiency would see a 30% increase, bridging the achievement gap with white peers. |
| Monitoring: | Subgroup data will be monitored and reviewed on a six week rotating analysis cycle with our SBLT/leadership team and during individual data chats with teachers. Review of lesson plans and walk through data to monitor the implementation of strategies from the Houses system and the use of gamification and other culturally responsive teaching techniques. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Ensure instructional supports are in place during core instruction and, including culturally responsive practices, School Wide Houses strategies and other's gained during our Boys gender study that would specifically pertain to our African American Boys in this ESSA subgroup. These supports include providing access to grade level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on specific needs from formative ELA assessments, unit mathematics assessments and MAP assessments. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | By implementing culturally relevant teaching strategies, ensuring that teachers understand the student data and can identify the specific need and have the strategies and resources to address the specific needs of students in this ESSA subgroup, students would make one year's worth of growth and bridge the gap by 20%. |

Action Steps to Implement

Individual data chats with teachers in August identifying students in the black ESSA subgroup and identify specific needs of these students as observed on either Spring MAP or Spring 2021 FSA mathematics and ELA scores.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Provide ongoing embedded training on Culturally Responsive and Equitable practices including blended learning (virtual/digital learning)- i.e- Flipgrid, Nearpod, other gamified apps that can be implemented in lessons).

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Continue to implement restorative practices and establish restorative classroom cultures throughout the school.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Encourage and monitor the enrollment and participation of black students in extended learning and leadership opportunities including: STEM, Promise Time, Boys Battle of the Books, STEP, student council/ PMAC, etc.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Monitor the academic and behavior recognition of black students through the layers of our PBIS Houses system.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Provide targeted professional development and coaching as needed to improve the use of culturally relevant teaching strategies and the recognition of Black students for academic and behavior goals met.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

1. Overall attendance has increased from 70% in 2019-2020 to 93.5% in 2020-2021.
2. The number of students with 20% or more absences are 43 or 9%.

Measurable Outcome: By implementing individualized action plans with students and their families, the number of students with 20% or more of absences would decrease by 50% by May of 2022, from 43 students (9%) to 22 students (4.5%).

Monitoring: Through the embedded analysis of attendance through CST twice monthly, the students who ended the year with 20% or more absences will be monitored and action plans will be put in place for any new families who begin to show trends in the same direction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Erika Thompson (thompsonerik@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement individualized action plans with both students and their families which include incentives for students who maintain attendance above 90% from month to month.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Because we have worked to increase attendance across the school, the area we need to focus on is reducing the number of students who have the low attendance rate.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify the specific 43 students. Separate by family and establish contacts on the leadership team for each family and each student, based on who has the positive relationships with the students and their families to serve as a positive adult connection on campus that the student will possibly work for and come to school for.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Work with students and families to identify any challenges or reasons that can be overcome and identify student incentives for maintaining monthly attendance above 90%.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Add a layer of public recognition of students including ensuring that these 43 students have increased opportunities to be recognized through our PBIS system when any positive attendance trends are seen for the student.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

#8. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

1. Our current level of performance of SWD in ELA on the FSA Spring 2021 assessment was 23% proficient.
2. Our current level of performance of SWD in relation to learning gains seen on the ELA FSA spring 2021 assessment was 25%.
3. Our current level of performance of SWD in Mathematics on the FSA Spring 2021 assessment was 18% proficient.
4. Our Current level of performance of SWD in relation to learning gains on the Mathematics FSA Spring 2021 assessment was 30%.

Measurable Outcome:

By creating a schedule allowing our VE resource to push in to our 4th and 5th grade classrooms and to creating a system which expects VE and General education teachers to collaboratively plan for access to a trajectory of rigorous tasks in both ELA and mathematics, learning gains in ELA will increase from 25% of students seeing gains to 50% of students seeing gains and from 30% of students seeing gains on FSA Mathematics to 50% of SWD students seeing learning gains in mathematics.

Monitoring:

Intentional walk through cycle planned for times when VE resource is pushing in and coteaching with General Education teacher to determine effectiveness of the model, feedback related to the model and monitoring of collaborative planning sessions through PLC notes and lesson plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Scheduling to ensure that VE resource can spend optimal time pushing into the 4th and 5th grade general education classrooms.

Creating a system where VE resource is collaborating with General education teachers to identify high yields strategies to implement within the classroom based on student IEP goals as well as planning for access to rigorous tasks in both ELA and Mathematics directly aligned to the standards being taught.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Based on the data analyzed from spring 2021 FSA, as well as historical data, it has been determined that specifically in 4th grade, there is a pattern of SWD under performing in all areas and specifically learning gains in both ELA and mathematics. After having conversation with VE Resource and looking at observational data, general education teachers need increased opportunities to plan with VE teachers to understand how they can provide high yields strategies that work in relation to the students abilities to give them access to grade level standards and to continue to accelerate the learning between where they are in relation to their goals and where the standard will be tested.

Action Steps to Implement

Work with VE and grade level teachers to create a schedule which optimizes the time that VE resource can provide instruction relating to grade level standards within the classroom during CORE instruction. Ensure that this schedule also allows for VE resource teachers to align their planning time daily to 4th and 5th grade planning blocks.

Person Responsible

Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Create and implement an observation/walk through schedule to ensure that push in model is being implemented with fidelity, having opportunity to speak to both General Education teacher and VE resource teacher together to identify areas of strength and areas for growth.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Monitor planning between VE resource and general education to ensure that time is being dedicated to identifying the needs of each student related to their IEP goals and ways in which access to grade level standards will be presented through high yields strategies during core instruction.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Data chat with the VE resource teacher and General Education teacher together to ensure that both are aware of the needs of the student and are having conversation centered around student data and next steps.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Based on the data reported in the Safe Schools for Alex dashboard, during the 2019-2020 school year, the school ranked #50 in the county for violent threats made, the top selection being bullying threats. This was an area of focus during the 2020-2021 school year and will continue to be an area of focus for the 2021-2022 school year. Through the use of our school wide houses system which we are continuing to modify to address the most critical school wide behavior needs and our implementation of commitment to character and SEL strategies through the morning news, classroom guidance lessons, restorative circles following all reported bullying referrals by certified members of our equity and restorative teams and individual plans made with students, students will receive multiple access points for access strategies that are alternatives to behavior that is consistent with substantiated bullying and threats.

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.

In order to build a positive school culture and environment for all students, our school adopted the international Houses program two years ago. This was adopted as part of the gender study that they school participates in. At the end of the previous school year, administration met with each team and took an intensive needs analysis of the positives and grows of the houses system so that moving forward it meets the needs of students at each grade level and adapts to fit the needs of various ages of students at different stages of development.

Moving forward the house system will be set up in the following way:

1. Every student in grades 1-5 will be sorted into a house immediately upon enrollment starting in August.
 2. August: School wide introduction of Guidelines for Success and changes to the house system. Including added incentive and recognition of students in relation to individual student goals aligned to the school improvement plan and student needs.
 2. September: Grades 1-5 will meet in grade level houses to define how the character traits that their house represents are inclusive of values of being a Manatee.
 3. September/October: Kindergarten will have a softer start to the houses system being sorted at a grade level celebration. They will participate in their first grade level house meeting in September/October.
 4. October: Whole grade level meeting to define for each other how the houses work together to uphold the values of being a Manatee. Common understanding that we are Better Together.
 5. November: Cross Grade Level Pairing for House Meeting (Service Project)
 6. December: Whole school House Meeting
- Repeat this rotation in the Spring.

In addition to the incorporation of the above the following layers are part of the house system:

1. House points to encourage togetherness. Monthly incentive for k-5 house with most points.
2. Weekly incentives for class with most points and house with most points to use the lounge during lunch.
3. Positive referrals that equal house points and additional time in lounge.
4. Analysis of students earning positive referrals with special attention looking at students within ESSA subgroups, students with attendance goals, and students struggling to meet academic goals.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

1. Teachers/staff- Utilizing the point system as appropriate and participating in the monthly house meeting and incentive program.
2. Administration- Supporting incentive program and maintaining consistency with the schedule to show students that their goals are important to their success and the success of the school (house).
3. PTA/volunteers- supporting incentive programs and volunteering on those days to ensure that the events are successful.
4. Parents- Working as a team with our school to encourage their child to reach the individual goals established.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---------------------------------------|----------------|-----|----------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | | | | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | | | | \$500.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 500-Materials and Supplies | 2301 - McMullen Booth Elementary Schl | TSSSA | | \$500.00 |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|--|--|--------------------------|-----|-------------------|
| | | | <i>Notes: Money allocated for materials and supplies to supplement the science lab, including science boards.</i> | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | \$500.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2301 - McMullen Booth Elementary Schl | School Improvement Funds | | \$500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Materials to supplement hands on experiences including additional manips and professional resources as identified in trainings attended. Materials to reward students who meet their identified goals on Dreambox and other assessments.</i> | | | |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$500.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2301 - McMullen Booth Elementary Schl | School Improvement Funds | | \$500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Materials to fund incentives for students who meet their goals on istation, formative assessments, and other checks. Materials towards purchasing additional resources to supplement classroom libraries.</i> | | | |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement | | | | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American | | | | \$0.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2301 - McMullen Booth Elementary Schl | School Improvement Funds | | \$0.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Materials and supplies related to gamification and creating learning opportunities within the classroom related to students in the Black ESSA subgroup.</i> | | | |
| 7 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | | | | \$250.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2301 - McMullen Booth Elementary Schl | School Improvement Funds | | \$250.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Materials and supplies related to gamification and creating learning opportunities within the classroom related to students in the Black ESSA subgroup.</i> | | | |
| 8 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | | | | \$250.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 2301 - McMullen Booth Elementary Schl | School Improvement Funds | | \$250.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Materials relating to book study for ESE and general ed to participate in together to understand high yields strategies to use within the classroom. Other materials needed to provide access to standards.</i> | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$2,000.00 |