

Pinellas County Schools

Azalea Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	11
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

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

2018-19 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 Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: B 2015-16: A 2014-15: B 2013-14: A
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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 and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Rebman, Michael	Principal
Principal	
	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	

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	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	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

27

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/23/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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
Attendance below 90 percent	19	15	18	15	18	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	13	29	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

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							

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
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
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
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? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

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	
Title	<p>ELA Reading Goal</p>
Rationale	<p>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 51% by May 2020. 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%.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>The percent of all students that are L25 will achieve ELA learning gains will increase from 42% to 51% as measured by FSA.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	<p>Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 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	<p>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 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</p>
Action Step	
Description	<p>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</p>

gen ed, ESE and EL teachers
Ongoing fidelity walkthroughs with feedback and support
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	
Title	Mathematics
Rationale	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 2020. 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%.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students that are L25 will achieve Math learning gains will increase from 41 to 51%, as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate mathematics-focused, consistent and sustained professional development through monthly curriculum meetings and weekly PLCs. Empower mathematics teacher leaders to facilitate alongside administrators. • 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	<p>Teaming in 4th grade impacted scheduling of appropriate interventions Dreambox was piloted in 4th and 5th grade with minimal PD and support 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</p>

Action Step	
Description	<p>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 mining Utilize data mining results to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. Determine with grade level teachers and plan what assessments will be</p>

given in between unit assessments

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

Principal, Asst. Principal, MTSS monitor bi-weekly

**Person
Responsible**

Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science
Rationale	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 2020. 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%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Develop, implement and monitor a data driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th Grade Diagnostic Assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Step	
Description	<p>Coordinate with District Science coach to organize rigorous review method for 5th grade teachers</p> <p>Utilize and analyze 5th grade diagnostic assessment to drive data based decision making</p> <p>Utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.</p> <p>Using Cycle and Diagnostic data to inform academic vocabulary gaming and additional learning experiences.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Use Unit assessments, SLAG's, and lab information/ data to guide instructional decisions</p>

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	
Title	Bridging the Gap
Rationale	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We expect our black student performance level to increase from 41% to 62% for Level 3 and above by May 2019. 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 2019.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	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) 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
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	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 Step	
Description	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	
Title	School Climate/ Conditions for Learning
Rationale	<p>1. Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 23 referrals. We expect our performance level to be 11.5 by May 2020.</p> <p>2. The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because lack of implementation fidelity of restorative practices</p> <p>3. If If restorative practices are implemented with fidelity would occur, the problem would be reduced by 50%, as evidenced by decrease discipline referrals. (include data to validate your hypothesis.)</p> <p>4. We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation of our strategies by September 2019.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of all students receiving referrals will decrease from 23 to 11.5, as measured by end of year referral data from school profiles.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Equity champions</p> <p>restorative practices</p> <p>PBIS</p> <p>Culturally relevant training</p> <p>SEL</p> <p>Access to rigorous and advanced courses</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>beliefs, mindset and practices need to be grounded in equity</p> <p>need for emotionally, intellectually and physically safe environments</p> <p>culturally relevant and rigorous instruction</p> <p>connectedness and belonging</p> <p>need of each and every learner are known and met</p>
Action Step	
Description	<p>Attend district-led, one day team training for Equity (Restorative and Culturally Responsive Practices)</p> <p>Ensure at least one staff member attend and becomes is a certified Trainer of RP</p> <p>Develop school-wide roll-out and development plan of Equity (Restorative and Culturally Responsive Practices)</p> <p>Principal become an equity champion, ensure 25% of teachers are CR trained, articulate tier 1 RP/ PBIS expectations</p> <p>Conduct learning opportunities.</p> <p>Monitor and support staff for implementation with fidelity.</p> <p>Review student and teacher data on weekly basis for trends and next steps.</p> <p>Update school-wide plan on a monthly basis.</p> <p>Celebrate areas of growth</p> <p>Update strategies for areas of improvement</p>
Person Responsible	SBLT will monitor bi-weekly Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	<p>1. Our current attendance rate is 84%. We expect our performance level to increase to 90% by May 2019.</p> <p>2. The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because Tier 2 and tier 3 intervention plans not occurring with fidelity .</p> <p>3. If (Tier 2 and tier 3 intervention plans were occurring with fidelity) would occur, the problem would be reduced by 6%.</p> <p>4. We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation of our strategies by September 2019.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students missing more than 10% of school will decrease by 6%, 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 Step	
Description	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
Person Responsible	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 Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Family and Community Engagement
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

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	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.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Step

Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listening, teacher led and student led conferences • 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 • Principal, classroom teacher • Quaterly • Weekly • Listening, teacher led and student led conferences • Website • Curriculum Nights/ Events • Principal, classroom teacher • Quaterly • Weekly • Listening, teacher led and student led conferences • Family conferences at any tier of MTSS • SAC
--------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- PTA • Principal, classroom teacher, MTSS • Quaterly
 - Weekly
 - Every 6 weeks
 - Every month
 - Listening, teacher led and student led conferences
 - Family conferences at any tier of MTSS
 - SAC
 - PTA
 - Mural Committee
-
- Business partner Meetings • Principal, classroom teacher, MTSS • Quaterly
 - Weekly
 - Every 6 weeks
 - Every month

Person Responsible Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	<p>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.</p> <p>2. We expect our performance level to be 1 out of 6 by May 2020.</p> <p>3. The problem/gap is occurring because team follow through and initiative.</p> <p>4. If the team follows through and takes initiative performance increases would occur.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	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 Step	
Description	<p>Continue the Farm to Table program</p> <p>Assign a new Wellness Coordinator to ensure we meet our goals</p> <p>Healthy schools team meets to oversee school health and safety policies and programs.</p> <p>Ensure implementation of local policies to meet Bronze recognition</p>
Person Responsible	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	Students with Disabilities (SWD)
Rationale	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our current level of performance is 37%, as evidenced in 2019 FSA Proficiency Scores in ELA. . 2. We expect our proficiency performance level to be 51% on the 2020 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%.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of SWD 2020 ELA FSA proficiency will increase from 37% to 51%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>SWD requiring work towards mastery of meaningful Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). Ensure that students requiring ESE services receive instruction designed to teach students to advocate for their academic, social and emotional needs. Inclusive scheduling for all SWD to maximum extent possible</p> <p>Common planning for VE teachers.</p> <p>Calendar PLC for Gen Ed cluster teachers and VE teachers</p> <p>Cluster SWD by total number and skill into specified classrooms for best support by gen ed and ESE teacher</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Problems/ Change Areas: Lots of pull out, lack of student growth, weak choice of core/ intervention support, SDI overused, lack of accountability and monitoring, lack of standards based planning, poor use of allocated resources, lack of scheduling with admin, minimal collaborating of ESE and Gen Ed, classroom teachers not feeling supported

Action Step	
Description	<p>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 indicators when compared to their like peers. PLCs will focus on learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content</p> <p>Monitor early warning 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</p>

Data Chats with ESE Teachers (resource and self-contained) to review universal and progress monitoring 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 Least Restrictive Environment

Person Responsible Michael Rebman (rebmanm@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

N/A

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA Reading Goal				\$300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3336	899200-OTHER EXPENDITURES - NONOPERATING	0111 - Azalea Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$300.00
<i>Notes: Additional leveled books for guided reading groups</i>						
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Mathematics				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3376	120-Classroom Teachers	0111 - Azalea Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$0.00
<i>Notes: TDE to visit other teacher classrooms</i>						
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Science				\$0.00
4	III.A	Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap				\$0.00
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: School Climate/ Conditions for Learning				\$0.00
6	III.A	Areas of Focus: Attendance				\$0.00
7	III.A	Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement				\$0.00
8	III.A	Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools				\$0.00
9	III.A	Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities (SWD)				\$300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3230	120-Classroom Teachers	0111 - Azalea Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$300.00

	<i>Notes: TDE - Teacher time to analyze IEP date to draft IEP</i>
	Total: \$600.00