

Pinellas County Schools

Fairmount Park Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 17 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

Fairmount Park Elementary School

575 41ST ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33711

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

Demographics

Principal: Lakisha Lawson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (32%) 2016-17: F (29%) 2015-16: D (33%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| 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

At Fairmount Park Elementary, we will promote the growth of lifelong learning and academic excellence by teaching the WHOLE child through a broad-based curriculum which fosters a positive self-concept, creativity, self-discipline, values and life skills.

Provide the school's vision statement

100% Scholar Success - Together We Succeed - TEAMWORK!

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Lawson, LaKisha | Principal | Governs the daily operations of the school and leads teaching and learning. |
| Clarkson, Dominique | Assistant Principal | Help governs the daily operations of the school and leads teaching and learning. |
| Nyarkoh, Candice | Guidance Counselor | 504/ELL/ Gifted Coordinator, provides Tier 1, 2, and 3 behavior interventions, advocates for students, Bully investigations and preventions, Tier 3 Coordinator, Pack-a-Snack Coordinator |
| Foley, Katy | Instructional Coach | Supports school improvement plan, communicates processes/ procedures of MTSS, assist teachers with becoming data wise, SBLT facilitator, fidelity of Tier 2, and monitors resources for curriculum interventions. |
| Johnson, Caprice | Instructional Coach | Coaches teachers through the 5 E's, 10-70-20, support Science Labs and Core Science instruction, and provides professional development. |
| St. Julien, Laurie | Instructional Coach | Monitors Core Mathematics instruction, Coaches teachers through the use of Coaching Cycles, and provides enrichment as well as professional development |
| Andrews, Jill | Instructional Coach | Monitors Core Literacy instruction, Coaches teachers through the use of Coaching Cycles, provides enrichment and professional development. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Lakisha Lawson

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

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 | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (32%) 2016-17: F (29%) 2015-16: D (33%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| 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 | 39 | 83 | 82 | 91 | 74 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 445 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 60 | 62 | 67 | 51 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 293 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 11 | 22 | 24 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 6 | 20 | 21 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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 7/16/2020

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 | 89 | 89 | 79 | 98 | 62 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 502 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 33 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 15 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 |
| One or more suspensions | 6 | 15 | 19 | 26 | 16 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 22 | 23 | 17 | 19 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 |

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 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 17 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |

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 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Number of students enrolled | 89 | 89 | 79 | 98 | 62 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 502 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 33 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 15 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 |
| One or more suspensions | 6 | 15 | 19 | 26 | 16 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 22 | 23 | 17 | 19 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 |

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 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 17 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |

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 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 19% | 54% | 57% | 17% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 38% | 59% | 58% | 33% | 47% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 69% | 54% | 53% | 35% | 40% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 39% | 61% | 63% | 34% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 50% | 61% | 62% | 45% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 69% | 48% | 51% | 39% | 42% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 15% | 53% | 53% | 18% | 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 | 23% | 56% | -33% | 58% | -35% |
| | 2018 | 19% | 53% | -34% | 57% | -38% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 20% | 56% | -36% | 58% | -38% |
| | 2018 | 16% | 51% | -35% | 56% | -40% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 13% | 54% | -41% | 56% | -43% |
| | 2018 | 15% | 50% | -35% | 55% | -40% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 48% | 62% | -14% | 62% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 41% | 62% | -21% | 62% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 45% | 64% | -19% | 64% | -19% |
| | 2018 | 33% | 62% | -29% | 62% | -29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 24% | 60% | -36% | 60% | -36% |
| | 2018 | 32% | 61% | -29% | 61% | -29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 13% | 54% | -41% | 53% | -40% |
| | 2018 | 22% | 57% | -35% | 55% | -33% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| 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 | 10 | 30 | 55 | 31 | 67 | 83 | 18 | | | | |
| BLK | 18 | 37 | 70 | 39 | 52 | 77 | 13 | | | | |
| HSP | 29 | 64 | | 47 | 27 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 36 | | | 42 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 18 | 36 | 69 | 40 | 51 | 71 | 14 | | | | |

| 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 | 8 | 32 | 60 | 13 | 48 | 57 | 8 | | | | |
| BLK | 16 | 31 | 31 | 33 | 44 | 35 | 18 | | | | |
| HSP | 36 | | | 73 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | 20 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 17 | 33 | 38 | 34 | 49 | 45 | 19 | | | | |

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 | 43 |
| 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 | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 299 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 42 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 44 |
| 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 | 42 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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 | 39 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 43 |
| 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

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we were exempt from state assessments. Therefore, our data analysis is from our 2018-2019 academic school year. According to the 2019 state assessment data, Science proficiency is the lowest data component, with 15%. English Language Arts proficiency trends for this group of scholars for the past three years has been low. There is a correlation between reading and science performance.

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

Science proficiency also had the greatest decline, decreasing from 18% to 15%. Low reading proficiency and classroom climate contributed to this decline.

As we transitioned to digital learning, our percentage of scholars missing 10% or more of school increased from 33% to 66%.

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

Compared to the state average, both English Language Arts and Science proficiency had a gap of 38. This shows a correlation between our English Language Arts proficiency (19%) and Science proficiency (15%).

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

Lowest 25% of English Language Arts and L25 Math showed the most growth with each improving to 69%.

Actions included: Professional Learning Communities were strategically calendared based on academic data and need, more focused monitoring of Lowest 25% of scholars by Site

Based Leadership Team/teachers, and the fidelity of the interventions. All Lowest 25% of scholars had a staff mentor who met with them weekly.

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

Attendance continues to be an area of concern. This year, 66% of our scholars were present less than 90% of the instructional school year.

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

1. Attendance
2. Strengthening Instructional Practice
3. Improve Conditions for Learning including Culture and Climate

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | During the 2019-20 school year, 66% of our scholars were present less than 90% of the instructional school year. |
| Measureable Outcome: | The percent of all scholars in attendance daily will decrease from 66% missing 10% or more of school to 33% as measured by Pinellas County Schools Profiles Data. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | LaKisha Lawson (lawsonlak@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Fairmount Park Elementary staff will participate in Child Study Team (CST) meetings weekly to utilize the problem solving worksheet for grade level attendance. Class Dojo will be used as a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) for attendance. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Missing more than 10% of school in one school year puts the scholar at risk for retention. Strengthening the Tiered process will build stronger relationships between the schools and families, while helping to identify barriers that are attributing to chronic absences. |

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Teachers will plan collaboratively alongside coaches in order to produce standards based lessons and tasks aligned to appropriate grade level content.

Our leadership team walk-through data from the 2019-2020 school year showed 50% or less of our instructional staff provided daily instruction and tasks that were appropriately aligned to grade level standards. By strengthening the instructional practice, we will increase scholar proficiency.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Increase achievement levels in all subgroups as categorized by ESSA, by increasing proficiency levels of scholars in the areas of English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science.

According to the 2019 Every Student Succeeds Act report, Fairmount Park Elementary School had a Federal Percent of Points Index of 32% for all scholars, with four out of five subgroups scoring below 41%: Black/African American (30%), White/Caucasian (10%), Economically Disadvantaged (34%), Students with Disabilities (32%), and Hispanic (55%).

Measureable Outcome:

TEACHER OUTCOME: By October, 50% of the Fairmount Park Elementary Instructional Staff will implement quality standards-based instruction daily as measured by Instructional Leadership Team walk through trend data and Instructional Practice Guide data. By January, 100% of the Fairmount Park Elementary Instructional Staff will implement quality standards-based instruction daily as measured by Instructional Leadership Team walk through trend data and Instructional Practice Guide data

SCHOLAR OUTCOME: Each scholar will increase proficiency and/or make a year's worth of growth, increasing each subgroup's Federal Percent of Points Index to 41% as measured by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) report.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

LaKisha Lawson (lawsonlak@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Fairmount Park Elementary instructional staff will participate in weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLC) focusing on standards-based planning, scholar work analysis protocol, development of Common Assessments, and analyzing data. The work of the PLCs will be centered around DeFour's PLC questions:

1. What is it we want our scholars to learn?
2. How will we know if each scholar has learned it?
3. How will we respond when some scholars do not learn it?
4. How can we extend and enrich the learning for scholars who have demonstrated proficiency?

Rationale for Evidence-

In order to provide scholars opportunities to engage in grade appropriate standards-based tasks (whether brick & mortar or virtual setting), teachers will be supported through a structure for PLCs focused on effective teaching methods for learning.

based
Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: During the 2019-2020 school year, Fairmount Park Elementary had 444 discipline referrals and 90 scholars with one or more suspensions, resulting in a detrimental loss of instructional time. Therefore, there is a need to strengthen teachers' systems of positive behavior supports and interventions.

Measureable Outcome: Decrease the number of discipline referrals and suspensions by 50% as identified by the previous year's data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dominique Clarkson (clarksond@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Full implementation of the school-wide Positive Behavior Intervention Support plan as measured by a classroom management essential task checklist (i.e. Structure, Teaching expectations for routines and activities, Observation and monitoring, and Corrections or S.T.O.I.C.).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our outcome to build positive relationships with scholars and their families while decreasing the over representation of African-American scholars being referred for discipline infractions and/or exceptional educational services. Our resources will come from Behavior management system, Conversation Help Activity Movement and Participation (CHAMPS) and Multi-Tier System of Support (MTSS).

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Pinellas County Schools Bridging the Gap Plan is a commitment created to close the achievement gap between black and non-black scholars. This plan was created due to the large discrepancy of performance on state assessments between blacks and non-blacks. Fairmount Park African American population Federal Index was 44% according to the ESSA data.

Measureable Outcome: Fairmount Park Elementary will increase the proficiency of our African-American scholars in ELA, Mathematics, and Science as measured by district and state assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: LaKisha Lawson (lawsonlak@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Fairmount Park Elementary instructional staff will participate in weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLC) focusing on standards-based planning, scholar work analysis protocol, development of Common Assessments, and analyzing data. The work of the PLCs will be centered around DeFour's PLC questions:

1. What is it we want our scholars to learn?
2. How will we know if each scholar has learned it?
3. How will we respond when some scholars do not learn it?
4. How can we extend and enrich the learning for scholars who have demonstrated proficiency?

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of data chats allows all stakeholders to know the scholars' current status as well as the expected performance level as it relates to them individually and as a school; resulting in them being able to communicate the data.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

In order to increase proficiency and ensure scholar success, we will create a culture of learning by implementing a system for equitable standards-based planning and implementation as well as school-wide processes and procedures centered around the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) model.

Teachers will conduct daily morning meetings using our Social Emotional Learning (SEL) curriculum.

Instructional and Support staff will build positive relationships with scholars, families, and the community (PTA).

We will have a school-wide implementation of PBIS.

We will create a school environment of support and celebrations for both scholars and staff.

Invite scholars and families to participate in school committees and family engagement activities. Participation will be monitored by our implementation the Power Parent Club.

Data chats will be held with all stakeholders (i.e. staff, scholars, families, and community) to monitor the progress of scholars and determine the instructional practices.

Families will have opportunities to engage in monthly academic family nights.

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: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | | | | \$3,600.00 |
|---|----------|---|--|--------------------------|-----|------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 6400 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 1211 - Fairmount Park Elementary Schl | School Improvement Funds | | \$3,600.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: To provide funds for stipends for teachers to attend professional development beyond the contracted day and school year.</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | | | | \$7,200.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|---|---|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| | 6400 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 1211 - Fairmount Park Elementary Schl | School Improvement Funds | | \$7,200.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Provide funds for stipends for teachers to attend professional development beyond the contracted day and school year.</i> | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | | | | \$7,200.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 6400 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 1211 - Fairmount Park Elementary Schl | School Improvement Funds | | \$7,200.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Provide funds for stipends for teachers to attend professional development beyond the contracted day and school year.</i> | | | |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American | | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | | | Total: | \$18,000.00 |