Pinellas County Schools

Azalea Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Azalea Elementary School

1680 74TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33710

http://www.azalea-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Michael Rebman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	64%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Attendance + Attitude + Academics = Excellence and Empowerment at Azalea Elementary

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	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rebman, Michael	Principal	Instructional leader Engage all stakeholders Grow the school community Collaborate in the school's decision making process
	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2016, Michael Rebman

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.*
0

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.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
26

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	64%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	83	99	83	84	66	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	19	21	21	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Thursday 6/18/2020

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	70	99	89	81	71	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	510
Attendance below 90 percent	0	22	2	14	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	14	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	1	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	70	99	89	81	71	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	510
Attendance below 90 percent	0	22	2	14	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	14	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	1	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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
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	56%	54%	57%	49%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	59%	58%	45%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	54%	53%	41%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	70%	61%	63%	66%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	62%	61%	62%	53%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	48%	51%	35%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	58%	53%	53%	51%	57%	55%

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	62%	56%	6%	58%	4%
	2018	51%	53%	-2%	57%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	56%	-11%	58%	-13%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	56%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
	2018	42%	50%	-8%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	76%	62%	14%	62%	14%
	2018	70%	62%	8%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	64%	0%	64%	0%
	2018	69%	62%	7%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	65%	60%	5%	60%	5%
	2018	56%	61%	-5%	61%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	53%	5%
	2018	50%	57%	-7%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	33	36	32	48	53	37	20				
ELL	35	27		70	73						
ASN	80			100							
BLK	33	44	33	44	50	43	38				
HSP	55	60		70	62		54				
MUL	62			92							
WHT	61	52	37	73	63	33	61				
FRL	49	46	47	65	58	41	57				

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 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
SWD	27	22		39	33	33	23				
ELL	21			68							
BLK	30	45	46	44	25						
HSP	26	28		75	79		40				
MUL	60			87							
WHT	56	46	25	68	52	33	62				
FRL	45	44	38	63	52	35	43				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	90
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
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	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Native American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Native American 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	54
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

The data component that showed the lowest component is ELA and Math L25.
Teaming in 4th grade impacted scheduling of appropriate interventions
Implementation phase of guided reading; lack of fidelity initiative
Dreambox was piloted in 4th and 5th grade with minimal PD and support
ISM helped recognized that there was an issue with target task alignment
ELP wasn't structured enough, meaning program choice, duration and intensity to support targeted L25 students
Development of a data culture among instructional staff

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was L25 ELA.
Teaming in 4th grade impacted scheduling of appropriate interventions
Implementation phase of guided reading; lack of fidelity initiative
ISM helped recognized that there was an issue with target task alignment
ELP wasn't structured enough, meaning program choice, duration and intensity to support targeted L25 students
Development of a data culture among instructional staff

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

ELA gains and ELA L25 gains
Teaming in 4th grade impacted scheduling of appropriate interventions
Implementation phase of guided reading; lack of fidelity initiative
ISM helped recognized that there was an issue with target task alignment
ELP wasn't structured enough, meaning program choice, duration and intensity to support targeted L25 students
Development of a data culture among instructional staff

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

Math L25
Analyze MAP data and created quadrant plans
Teacher awareness of their L25 students
Implementation of Dreambox
Standards based individualized differentiated instruction
ELP standards based remediation

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

Number of students with two or more indicators in all grades

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. ELA gains
3. ELA L25 gains
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	1. Our current level of performance is L25 learning gains is 42%, as evidenced in FSA ELA. 2. We expect our performance level to be 54% by May 2021. 3. The problem/gap is occurring because differentiation is not data driven and implemented with fidelity. 4. If differentiation is data driven and implemented with fidelity would occur, the problem would be reduced by 9%.
Measureable Outcome:	The percent of all proficient students on ELA FSA will increase from 56% to 62% as measured by FSA The percent of all students ELA learning gains will increase from 52% to 61% as measured by FSA The percent of all students that are L25 will achieve ELA learning gains will increase from 42% to 54% as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	• Facilitate ELA-focused, consistent and sustained professional development with a focus on standards-based instruction, target and task alignment, and the instructional shifts • Empower ELA champions/cohort teachers to develop as literacy leaders (co-facilitate PD sessions along side admin, open classrooms for ELA feedback, coach colleagues in literacy practices) • Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student learning gains have remained static and L25 gains declined Teaming in 4th grade impacted scheduling of appropriate interventions for L25, ESE and EL students Implementation phase of guided reading will continue as we transition to fidelity of use ISM helped recognize that there was an issue with target task alignment ELP wasn't structured enough, meaning program choice, duration and intensity to support targeted L25 students Development of a data culture among instructional staff

Action Steps to Implement

Continue use of LLI and IRLA for L25 during intervention
Coordinate JRGR training efforts with District staff developer and side by side coaching
Planning differentiated instruction for core instruction and intervention
*Ensure grade level text is scaffolded in for every student during the core
Organize and provide universal assessments (running record, spelling inventory, word list, etc.) KG - 5
Conduct universal assessments and make data based decisions to differentiate/ scaffold instruction for Gen. Ed, EL (ie. model performance indicators built into the modules) and SWD
Ongoing onsite PD with District Staff Developer to enhance staff capacity for gen ed, ESE and

EL teachers
Ongoing fidelity walkthroughs with feedback and support using ELA walkthrough tool
Teacher to teacher observations and side by side coaching as needed
Developed Extended Learning Program targeting L25 using the RISE program (ELA)

Person Responsible Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	1. Our current level of performance is is L25 learning gains is 41%, as evidenced in FSA Math. 2. We expect our performance level to be 51% by May 2021. 3. The problem/gap is occurring because differentiation is not data driven and implemented with fidelity. 4. If differentiation is data driven and implemented with fidelity would occur, the problem would be reduced by 9%.
Measureable Outcome:	The percent of all proficient students on Math FSA will increase from 70% to 74% as measured by FSA The percent of all students Math learning gains will increase from 62% to 71% as measured by FSA The percent of all students that are L25 will achieve Math learning gains will increase from 41% to 54%, as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitate mathematics-focused, consistent and sustained professional development through monthly curriculum meetings and weekly PLCs. Empower mathematics teacher leaders at each grade level to facilitate alongside administrators and guide team members in unit planning. Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, and Number Routines. Support this work through curriculum meetings, PLCs, feedback, and/or the use of classroom video.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Dreambox usage and learning was yielding excellent results with PD and support. Continued focus on Dreambox is necessary for continued growth Increased need for rigorous, student centered instruction through the use of Ready Classroom, Dreambox and Number Routines ELP wasn't structured enough, meaning program choice, duration and intensity to support targeted L25 students Development of a data culture among instructional staff Need to increase the math teacher leaders leadership

Action Steps to Implement

Coordinate with Ready Classroom and Dreambox trainer to provide PD to designated teachers
Utilize and analyze Ready Classroom and Dreambox Math program and data results
Utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/ scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
Utilize Classroom Ready and Dreambox lessons for small group/ 1-on-1 instruction
Coordinate Math differentiated support efforts with District staff developer
Correlate MAP and Dreambox results through data miniing
Utilize data mining results to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
Support MTL as they facilitate unit planning with grade level teachers
Teachers complete unit prerequisite checks in performance matters to determine student standard gaps

Utilize Classroom Ready and Dreambox lessons for small group/ 1-on-1 instruction and/ or other resources (ie. CPALMS) to drive differentiation based on concept areas needing improvement

Person Responsible Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	1. Our current level of performance is 58% level 3 or above, as evidenced in SSA Science. 2. We expect our performance level to be 65% level 3 or above by May 2021. 3. The problem/gap is occurring because vocabulary review requires increased rigor. 4. If the review plan is implemented with fidelity the problem would be reduced by 7%.
Measureable Outcome:	The percent of all students level 3 or above will increase from 58% to 65%, as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	• Utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model (10% setting the purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) and include appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignment to the 1st – 5th grade standards. Develop, implement and monitor a data driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th Grade Diagnostic Assessment. • Implement and monitor science academic gaming based on data, with a priority focus on the 60 Power Words and other related vocabulary based on grade level standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based instruction and review is key. A well developed standards driven review plan based on diagnostic data will drive individualized differentiated instruction in order to prepare students for success. A focus on the 60 power words supports student learning in order to best retain information from 3 grade levels of Science instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Coordinate with District Science coach to organize rigorous review method for 5th grade teachers
Utilize and analyze 5th grade diagnostic assessment to drive data based decision making
Utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/ scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
Using Cycle and Diagnostic data to inform academic vocabulary gaming and additional learning experiences.
Coordinate with District Science coach to utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model (10% setting the purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) and include appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignment to the 1st – 5th grade standards.
Use Unit assessments, SLAG's, and lab information/ data to guide instructional decisions
4th and 5th grade unit assessments will allow teachers to review results and low performing standards into the review plan

Person Responsible	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

#4. Other specifically relating to Bridging the Gap	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	1. We expect our black student performance level to increase from 41% to 62% for Level 3 and above by May 2021. 2. The problem/gap is occurring because students lack the fundamental reading skills teachers need targeted professional development in culturally relevant strategies, restorative practice, and advanced coursework for high achieving black students. . 3. If small group reading instruction and precise assessment measures are used holistically in all grades using Jan Richardson's Guided Reading would occur, the problem would be reduced by 50% 4. We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation of our strategies by September 2020.
Measureable Outcome:	The percent of black students receiving a Level 3 Achievement Score on FSA will increase from 41 percent (level 3,4,5 combined) to 64%, as measured by FSA The gap between black and white students is 41% and 54% respectively. The students have the same proficiency goal of 62%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Equity and Excellence for ALL (equity mindset, culturally relevant teaching, restorative practices/ PBIS)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Equity Coaching Project Provide targeted professional development and coaching to entire staff on culturally relevant strategies Culturally Relevant AVID strand 6 M's Embed character trait book of the month focused on diversity Create a "talented" program to serve students that are not gifted but are high performing Train entire staff on restorative practice Provide Equity for Excellence PD for entire staff Monitoring of the early warning system Mentors and goal planning for all black students with an enhanced focus on black students in grades 4 and 5 Invite all black students to ELP Weekly PLCs in which grade level data is reviewed and compared to promote efficient and effective use of the multitiered system

Action Steps to Implement

Provide targeted professional development and coaching to entire staff on culturally relevant strategies
Culturally Relevant AVID strand 6 M's
Embed character trait book of the month focused on diversity
Create a "talented" program to serve students that are not gifted but are high performing
Train entire staff on restorative practice
Monitoring of the early warning system
Mentors and goal planning for all black students with an enhanced focus on black students in grades 4 and 5

Invite all black students to ELP
Weekly PLCs in which grade level data is reviewed and compared to promote efficient and effective use of the multitiered system

Person Responsible Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As the result of equity-centered problem solving within an MTSS framework, Azalea developed an equity goal to build relational capacity, empower student voice, and hold high expectations within one of the following school improvement areas for equity systems change: Monthly Professional Development whole school focused on increasing the use of equitable practices (restorative practices) and in-class coaching with an Equity Coach focused on equitable practices (culturally relevant teaching) by the data explored using the Racial Equity Analysis Protocol (REAP) protocol identified this as an area of focus. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success and/or changes in staff practice and progress monitoring will be measured.
Measureable Outcome:	To address mindset shift for the adoption of equitable practice, we will participate in whole school equity-centered PD. Our current data illustrates an achievement gap as evidenced by ELA and Math proficiency scores and gains based on 2019 FSA. The issue may be impacted by strengthening restorative practices and culturally relevant teaching through sustained professional development. We will measure progress by recording the number of PD sessions, the number of teachers who attend PD and active participation during the sessions. We will measure medium-term outcomes by examining changes in teacher practice using a CRT classroom walkthrough tool and report the change in rate of observable CRT practices or the number of teachers who consistently practice CR as observed in classroom walkthroughs. We will measure long-term student outcomes by examining MAP assessment cycles leading up to the FSA with the goal of reducing the achievement gap.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using the Racial Equity Analysis Protocol (REAP) we've identified equitable practices (equitable grading, culturally relevant teaching, restorative practices, etc.) 2020-21 school year
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies and practices were identified using the Racial Equity Analysis Protocol (REAP).

Action Steps to Implement

WHAT: Professional Development has built into the staff work schedule for whole staff and classroom support
WHO: The Principal in collaboration with other site-based Equity Champions is planning site based PD based on Igniting Social Justice in the Classroom and Disrupting Inequity: Having Brave Conversations About Bias from UnboundED with embedded restorative practices addressing mindsets. Additionally, scheduled site visits with assigned Equity Coach to support classroom teachers equitable practices during in class restorative practices and culturally relevant teaching.
WHEN: Preschool PD, third Tuesday of every month for site based PD, optional Equity

Champion PD after school (4 - 3 hour sessions) facilitated by district staff developer and in-class coaching monthly

Person Responsible Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	1. Our current attendance rate is 93.1%. We expect our performance level to increase to 95% by May 2021. 2. The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because Tier 2 and tier 3 intervention plans not occurring with fidelity . 3. If (Tier 2 and tier 3 intervention plans were occurring with fidelity) would occur, the problem would be reduced by 6%. 4. We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation of our strategies by September 2020.
Measureable Outcome:	The percent of all students missing more than 10% of school will decrease by 4%, as measured by attendance dashboard data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Fidelity of tier 2 and 3 intervention plans
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The problem gap in attendance remained the same from the prior school year

Action Steps to Implement

Principal will call parents in the first 10 days that are chronic attendance concerns and SAR students with poor attendance explaining the school expectations

Review attendance taking process and school-wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff. SBLT Monthly

Asset map the attendance resources, interventions and incentives at our school to support increased attendance for each Tier. Tier 3 Problem Solving Team Weekly

Develop and implement attendance incentive programs and competitions. Tier 3 Problem Solving Team Weekly

Engage students and families in attendance related activities to ensure they are knowledgeable of the data and aware of the importance of attendance. CST Bi-weekly

Review data and effectiveness of school-wide attendance strategies on a bi-weekly basis. CST Bi-weekly
Implement Tier 2 and 3 plans for student specific needs and review barriers and effectiveness on a bi-weekly basis. Tier 3 Problem Solving Team; CST Weekly; Bi-weekly

Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes (e.g. Pending entries cleared). DMT; Social Worker Daily

Person Responsible Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Community Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	It is difficult to attract and maintain our PTA board with parents. The Principal will develop a Family Engagement Action Team (FEAT) consisting of staff members that are also parents. This team will ensure family and community engagement is always thriving with focus on a strong school-family collaborative partnership
Measureable Outcome:	The number of all parents engaging in the planning and preparation of school-family events will increase from 4 to 13 as measured by the PTA Board and FEAT. Improve the number of students that have a mentor from 5 to 10 by accessing the Lunch Pals program
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Effectively communicate with families about their students' progress and school processes/practices. 2. Provide academic tools to families in support of their students' achievement at home. 3. Purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to advocate for their students. 4. Intentionally build positive relationships with families and community partners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ensure school-family collaborative partnerships are improved, consistent and well-developed

Action Steps to Implement

Use student data to drive how families support learning at home. Building trusting relationships with families has to go beyond involvement in traditional volunteer opportunities and move to being equal partners in student academic success. Our efforts to really partner with parents need to be aligned to the Dual Capacity Building Framework for Family School Partnerships.
• Weekly Update
• AAA Achievement Celebrations
• Website
• Curriculum Nights/ Events
• Listening, teacher led and student led conferences
• Family conferences at any tier of MTSS
• SAC
• PTA
Advertise Parent Academy Power Hours
Front Office Staff attend Family Friendly Schools District PD
Staff attend Collaborate for Success District PD

Person Responsible	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

#8. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	1. Our current level of performance is 0 out of 6 Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Assessment modules, as evidenced in Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Assessment. 2. We expect our performance level to be 1 out of 6 by May 2021. 3. The problem/gap is occurring because team follow through and initiative. 4. If the team follows through and takes initiative performance increases would occur.
Measureable Outcome:	The number of all students engaging in lifelong healthy habits will increase from 0 modules recognized to 1 module recognized, as measured by Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Follow and implement the alliance for a healthier generation healthy schools program assessment modules
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We need to engage in and complete the modules so the students are engaging in enhanced, purposeful, evidence based lifelong healthy habits

Action Steps to Implement

Continue the Farm to Table program
Assign a new Wellness Coordinator to ensure we meet our goals
Healthy schools team meets to oversee school health and safety policies and programs.
Ensure implementation of local policies to meet Bronze recognition

Person Responsible	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

#9. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	1. Our current level of performance is 33%, as evidenced in 2019 FSA Proficiency Scores in ELA. . 2. We expect our proficiency performance level to be 51% on the 2021 ELA FSA. 3. The problem/gap is occurring because core instruction is not supported with fidelity, data driven differentiation is not specific enough, major curriculum data used (not SDI) is not aligned to overall school processes, and teacher schedules do not maximize student support. 4. If data driven differentiation and extensive instruction in specialized curriculum would occur, the problem would be reduced by 14%.
Measureable Outcome:	The percent of SWD 2021 ELA FSA proficiency will increase from 33% to 51%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	• Collaboratively plan with classroom teachers for grade level, student-centered complex tasks, deliberately planned with a trajectory of rigor and challenge, utilizing appropriate ESE strategies including: higher level questioning and explicit vocabulary instruction • Monitor the use of appropriate curriculum and supportive strategies to ensure student needs are met. • Implement a process for placing students requiring ESE services in master schedules first in order to optimize service delivery, focusing on a clustering process to meet student needs. • Provide opportunities for ESE and general education teachers to co-plan for differentiated instruction and support delivery of services. • Collect and interpret data from Dream Box, Istation, OPM, and MAP to monitor progress with IEP goals and objectives and drive instruction based on student need, including regular and purposeful adjustment to accommodations and interventions. • Collaborate to create a schedule that promotes a “push-in” model of learning support (VE Resource Starr and general education teachers).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusion practices lacked consistency to best meet student needs Inconsistent choice of core/ intervention support and OPM aligned to student needs and whole school processes and student needs Increase accountability and monitoring by administration Continued need for standards based planning with classroom teachers Inclusive scheduling - master scheduling built around SWD

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly PLCs with grade level teams to monitor ESE students and review data to make instructional decisions and implement interventions to use resources effectively and target students based on data when compared to their like peers. PLCs will focus on learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content

Monitor EWS indicators in weekly HUB meeting and revise plans utilizing PBIPs and FBAs. Monitoring of the plans and data collection will be utilized to adjust the plans every 6-8 weeks. Students will be taught to receive instruction designed to teach students to advocate

for their academic, social and emotional needs

Data Chats with ESE Teachers to review universal and OPM data on IEP goals. PLCs will focus on specialized instructional strategies as well as learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content in the LRE

PD: Equipped for Reading Success and book study

Person Responsible Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

#10. Other specifically relating to School Climate/ Conditions for Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Using the Equity-Centered Problem-Solving Process: • Analyze current level of performance using multiple data points • Brainstorm and prioritize alterable barriers contributing to the problem/gap in performance • Develop predictions on what evidence-based strategy would eliminate or reduce the impact of the target barrier • Identify methods and times to monitor implementation fidelity and effectiveness of action plan steps used to implement targeted strategies. Data to be considered: Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs), ISS, OSS, Classroom Behavior Calls, Classroom Referrals/Incident Reports (minor), Behavior Infractions, Risk Ratios, Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI), Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ), Tier 1 PBIS Walkthrough with Restorative Practices Elements, STOIC Checklist
Measureable Outcome:	Our current level of performance is 15 referrals the problem is occurring because of an inconsistency in the understanding and application of behavioral expectations. If expectations were clearly defined and taught, the problem would be reduced by 80% to 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS Restorative Practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies and actions are based on research and evidence-based nationally recognized programs (PBIS and Restorative Practices). The specific strategies and actions within our SIP were selected to match our school-specific needs based on our review of data utilizing an equity problem-solving process.

Action Steps to Implement

WHAT: Expectations are clearly defined, taught, and reinforced
WHO: All staff monitoring student behavior in common areas will engage with students to provide feedback, both positive and corrective, and will refer to signage reflecting Guidelines for Success (expectations) that are posted in common areas when doing so.
WHEN: Preschool review of SBLT created PBIS matrix. At least weekly, teachers will review and re-teach expectations and rules. SBLT will establish plans for expectations to be reviewed bi-weekly based on current data to be used in routine Restorative Circles.
A system of recognition will be established to provide rewards to students for demonstration of positive and appropriate behaviors that are identified in the expectations/rules. By the end of the first semester, at least 90% of school members (students and staff) will participate in reward/recognition system and the rewards will be varied and reflect student interests (based on student input).

Person Responsible	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Identified areas of focus will address the school improvement priority identified in 2.E.

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.

PFEP Attached

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$4,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3336	899200-OTHER EXPENDITURES - NONOPERATING	0111 - Azalea Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$4,000.00
			Notes: Intervention kits, curriculum and a data dashboard to best support students foundational skill needs			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$0.00**
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: Bridging the Gap**				**$0.00**
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity**				**$0.00**
6	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance**				**$0.00**
7	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Community Involvement**				**$0.00**
8	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools**				**$0.00**

9	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**	**$0.00**
10	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: School Climate/ Conditions for Learning**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$4,000.00**