

Pinellas County Schools

# Bauder Elementary School



## 2019-20 School Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>22</b> |

# Bauder Elementary School

12755 86TH AVE, Seminole, FL 33776

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Lisa Bultmann A**

Start Date for this Principal: 10/10/2018

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2018-19 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 27%   |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>Students With Disabilities<br>White Students |
| <b>School Grade</b>  | 2018-19: A  |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2017-18: A<br>2016-17: A<br>2015-16: A<br>2014-15: A<br>2013-14: A  |
| <b>2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*</b>   |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Tracy Webley</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N   |
| <b>Year</b>  | A   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A   |

\* 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement

Preparing all Bauder students for on or above grade level work in middle school and beyond by collaborating as educators and a community.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

Building 100% success with Quality and Honor

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name                | Title               |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Leichman, Jodi      | Principal           |
| Principal           |                     |
| Baker, John         | Assistant Principal |
| Assistant Principal |                     |
| Jennings, Lynn      | Guidance Counselor  |
| Guidance Counselor  |                     |
| Mancuso, Danielle   | Teacher, K-12       |
| Teacher, K-12       |                     |
| Dodaro, Perri       | Teacher, K-12       |
| Teacher, K-12       |                     |
| Koehler, Kim        | Teacher, K-12       |
| Teacher, K-12       |                     |
| Smoot, Patty        | Teacher, PreK       |
| Teacher, PreK       |                     |
| Webber, Danielle    | Teacher, K-12       |
| Teacher, K-12       |                     |
| Theis, Danielle     | Teacher, K-12       |
| Teacher, K-12       |                     |
| Whitehouse, Sharon  | Teacher, K-12       |
| Teacher, K-12       |                     |
| Pearson, Kim        | Teacher, K-12       |
| Teacher, K-12       |                     |

### 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     | 96          | 118 | 113 | 117 | 126 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 690   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 7   | 5   | 9   | 6   | 10  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 37    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 2   | 20  | 16  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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

36

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

Tuesday 7/2/2019

**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     | 9           | 6 | 12 | 9  | 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 58 |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     |    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 1  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0  | 22 | 17 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 55 |

**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 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 8  |

**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             | 74%    | 54%      | 57%   | 67%    | 50%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 68%    | 59%      | 58%   | 51%    | 47%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 71%    | 54%      | 53%   | 40%    | 40%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            | 79%    | 61%      | 63%   | 80%    | 61%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 68%    | 61%      | 62%   | 67%    | 56%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 45%    | 48%      | 51%   | 51%    | 42%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         | 68%    | 53%      | 53%   | 76%    | 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                   | 96 (0)                            | 118 (0) | 113 (0) | 117 (0) | 126 (0) | 120 (0) | 690 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent                   | 0 ( )                             | 7 ( )   | 5 ( )   | 9 ( )   | 6 ( )   | 10 ( )  | 37 (0)  |
| One or more suspensions                       | 0 ( )                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math                 | 0 ( )                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 1 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 1 (0)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment               | 0 ( )                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 2 (0)   | 20 (0)  | 16 (0)  | 38 (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.

| <b>ELA</b>            |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 03                    | 2019        | 73%           | 56%             | 17%                               | 58%          | 15%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 69%           | 53%             | 16%                               | 57%          | 12%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 4%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 04                    | 2019        | 74%           | 56%             | 18%                               | 58%          | 16%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 61%           | 51%             | 10%                               | 56%          | 5%                             |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 13%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | 5%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 05                    | 2019        | 73%           | 54%             | 19%                               | 56%          | 17%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 68%           | 50%             | 18%                               | 55%          | 13%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 5%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | 12%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>MATH</b>           |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 03                    | 2019        | 79%           | 62%             | 17%                               | 62%          | 17%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 87%           | 62%             | 25%                               | 62%          | 25%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -8%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 04                    | 2019        | 80%           | 64%             | 16%                               | 64%          | 16%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 72%           | 62%             | 10%                               | 62%          | 10%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 8%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | -7%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 05                    | 2019        | 72%           | 60%             | 12%                               | 60%          | 12%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 78%           | 61%             | 17%                               | 61%          | 17%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -6%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>SCIENCE</b>        |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 05                    | 2019        | 67%           | 54%             | 13%                               | 53%          | 14%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 74%           | 57%             | 17%                               | 55%          | 19%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -7%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |



**Subgroup Data**

| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b> |
| SWD  | 46              | 53            |                    | 64               | 47             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 36              |               |                    | 45               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 61              | 75            |                    | 61               | 63             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| MUL  | 94              | 92            |                    | 78               | 62             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 75              | 66            | 67                 | 81               | 69             | 46                  | 71              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 63              | 69            | 71                 | 64               | 69             | 50                  | 55              |                |                  |                          |                                |

| <b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b> |
| SWD  | 57              | 38            |                    | 57               | 69             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 31              |               |                    | 46               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 59              | 36            |                    | 77               | 79             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| MUL  | 53              |               |                    | 80               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 70              | 56            | 46                 | 81               | 67             | 47                  | 76              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 55              | 42            | 27                 | 72               | 66             | 52                  | 69              |                |                  |                          |                                |

**ESSA Data**

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

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A  |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students  | 68   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |      |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 473  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |

**Subgroup Data**

| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>   |    |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 53 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |     |
|--|-----|
| 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   |
| <b>Asian Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 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   |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 65  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 82  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |
| <b>Pacific Islander Students</b>   |     |
| 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   |
| <b>White Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 68  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |

| <b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>   |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 63 |
| 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**

Our 5th grade Science overall achievement was 67%, which was the lowest area for performance. 3rd and 5th grade Math also showed a drop in percentage from the previous year. Some contributing factors are that in November, 2018, one of the 5th grade teachers went out on medical leave and a long-term sub finished the year. The 5th grade team was inconsistent in carrying out a plan for improvement of Science vocabulary. The trend data indicates that where we increase in our percentage of L25 in Reading one year, our percentage of L25 in Math seems to decrease.

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

Science was our area with the greatest decline (-7%). The loss of a strong Science teacher to medical leave and then the loss of a strong teacher that managed the weekly Science review was key.

#### **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**

The state ELA achievement percentage is 57% and Bauder's ELA achievement percentage is 74%. The state Math achievement percentage is 61% and Bauder's Math achievement percentage is 79%.

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

Our ELA across the grade levels showed the most improvement. As a school, we targeted the intervention that each child received during our grade level intervention block to ensure that the intervention was research-based and addressed the deficit identified by the assessments.

#### **Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

An area of concern is the high number of students at 4th and 5th grade who were Level 1 on the state assessment. A second area of concern is the numbers at 3rd and 5th grade for students who had less than 90% attendance.

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

1. Differentiation in CORE instruction to ensure all students are meeting mastery of the grade level standards.
2. Data-based Decision Making to guide instructional decisions to ensure struggling students are properly identified and a plan for increasing their learning gains in all content areas.
3. Student tracking of progress within a student-centered environment.
4. Ensuring instruction is rigorous for all of our gifted students to ensure continuous and sustained achievement and learning gains.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>#1</b>  |  |
| <b>Title</b>   | ELA/Reading  |
| <b>Rationale</b>   | Our current level of performance is 74% as evidenced by the FSA ELA assessment. We expect our performance to be 81% by May, 2020. The problem/gap is occurring because lessons are not being differentiated to ensure students can demonstrate mastery of standards at the appropriate level of complexity. If differentiation of instruction would occur, the problem would be reduced by 7%.   |
| <b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | By May, 2020, the percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 74% to 81% as measured by the 2020 FSA ELA assessment. The students in the lowest quartile will improve proficiency results from 71% to 81% as measured by the 2020 FSA ELA assessment.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                 | Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                   | Facilitate consistent and sustained professional development with a focus on strategies for differentiation and delivering instruction designed according to principles of differentiation research in a student-centered classroom environment.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                     | This strategy was selected as teachers consistently identified differentiation during CORE and intervention as an area for professional growth. During the 2018-2019 school year, ISM feedback along with classroom walkthrough and observation data, confirmed differentiation as a priority for this school year.  |
| <b>Action Step</b>   |  |
| <b>Description</b>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Administrators will ensure consistent and sustained professional development on strategies of differentiation.</li> <li>2. Teachers develop rigorous learning goals for students to ensure mastery of standards at the appropriate level of complexity.</li> <li>3. Teachers will collaborate and intentionally plan instruction with a focus on evidence of differentiation of process, product or content.</li> <li>4. Teachers will utilize a variety of instructional strategies to ensure differentiation in the CORE and during intervention periods.</li> <li>5. Grade-level Leaders will engage in specific, targeted, actionable feedback with their colleagues regarding implementation of differentiation strategies to ensure mastery of standards at the appropriate level of complexity.</li> <li>6. Administrators will monitor teacher practice and provide specific, targeted, actionable feedback that includes the implementation of differentiation strategies to support teacher growth.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>  | Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)   |

**#2****Title**

Math

**Rationale**

Our current level of performance is 79% as evidenced by the FSA Math assessment. We expect our performance to be 85% by May, 2020. The problem/gap is occurring because lessons are not being differentiated to ensure students can demonstrate mastery of standards at the appropriate level of complexity. If differentiation of instruction would occur, the problem would be reduced by 6%.

**State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve**

By May, 2020, the percent of all students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 79% to 85% as measured by the 2020 FSA Math assessment. The students in the lowest quartile will improve learning gains results from 45% to 85% as measured by the 2020 FSA Math assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy**

Facilitate consistent and sustained professional development with a focus on strategies for differentiation and delivering instruction designed according to principles of differentiation research in a student-centered classroom environment.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

This strategy was selected as teachers consistently identified differentiation as an area for professional growth. During the 2018-2019 school year, ISM feedback along with classroom walkthrough and observation data, confirmed differentiation as a priority for this school year.

**Action Step****Description**

1. Administrators will ensure consistent and sustained professional development on strategies of differentiation.
2. Teachers develop rigorous learning goals to ensure mastery of standards at the appropriate level of complexity.
3. Teachers will collaborate and intentionally plan instruction with a focus on evidence of differentiation of process, product or content.
4. Teachers will utilize Ready Classroom materials to deliver standards-based, rigorous instruction.
5. Teachers will utilize rate of improvement Dreambox data to set goals with students for progress and improvement.
6. Grade-level Leaders will engage in specific, targeted, actionable feedback with their colleagues regarding implementation of differentiation strategies to ensure mastery of standards at the appropriate level of complexity.
7. Administrators will monitor teacher practice and provide specific, targeted, actionable feedback that includes the implementation of differentiation strategies to support teacher growth.
8. District Math Coaches will support implementation of rigorous instructional strategies aligned with Standards of Mathematical practice.

**Person Responsible**

Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)

**#3****Title**

Science

**Rationale**

Our current level of performance is 67% as evidenced by the NGSSS Science assessment. We expect our performance to be 82% by May, 2020. The problem/gap is occurring because the focus for Science instruction has not been on acquisition of Science vocabulary. If priority is given to Science vocabulary acquisition, the problem would be reduced by 9%.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve**

By May, 2020, the percent of all students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 68% to 82% as measured by the 2020 NGSSS Science assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy**

Implement and monitor science academic gaming based on Science diagnostic data, with a priority focus on the 60 Power Words and other related vocabulary based on grade level standards.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

Our 2018-2019 NGSSS proficiency rates declined from the 2017-2018 results. Over the last several years, our Science scores are inconsistently trending and success is not being sustained.

**Action Step****Description**

1. Utilize diagnostic data to identify instructional resources to support the ongoing review and expansion of learning with an emphasis on informational text and Science academic vocabulary.
2. Teachers will engage in coaching sessions with District Science coach for support with academic vocabulary strategies.
3. Teachers will utilize Fall diagnostic data and utilize item analysis strategies to identify lowest 3rd and 4th grade standards for Life, Physical, Earth and NOS to support planning and intervention for students.
4. 3rd, 4th and 5th Grade Teachers will administer the unit assessments and utilize the data to identify low proficiency standards and add them to the review plan.
5. Teachers utilize the "Differentiated Resources" section in the curriculum guide to identify instructional supports for students.
6. Teachers will utilize engaging technology resources for assessment and monitor student mastery of the 60 Power Words.
7. ELP will be utilized with 5th grade students to remediate standards below proficiency.

**Person Responsible**

Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)

**#4**

**Title** Bridging the Gap (Black Student Achievement)

**Rationale**

Our current level of performance is 41% as evidenced by the FSA ELA assessment. We expect our performance to be 80% by May, 2020. The problem/gap is occurring because African-American students are not being provided with culturally responsive content and resources. If lessons were culturally responsive and relevant, the problem would be reduced by 39%.

**State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve**

By May, 2020, the percent of black students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 41% to 80% as measured by the 2020 FSA ELA assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy**

Teachers will connect students to content through culturally responsive and relevant practices. Lessons will reflect awareness and understanding of referents and resources that are meaningful for students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

This strategy will disrupt system inequity for black students.

**Action Step****Description**

1. Teachers will intentionally plan for the differentiated needs of each student with consideration of the principles of Universal Design Learning and Culturally Relevant instruction to ensure content is accessible to the broadest range of learners.
2. Teachers will reduce barriers to the curriculum and optimize levels of challenge in order to support and meet the needs of black students.
3. Students will be provided with choice and voice in access to content, process and products associated with the curriculum.
4. Equity champions will facilitate teacher learning within PLCs, PD opportunities and model classroom observations.
5. Administrators will give specific, actionable feedback to teachers on structures and strategies being used such as class meetings, restorative circles, and cooperative learning.
6. Using three year trend data, individualized intervention/extension plans will be developed for all black students by Administrators and Grade Level teaching teams.
7. Using ongoing assessment data, black student progress will be analyzed by Administrators and Grade Level teaching teams with focused interventions or extensions identified and implemented for each student.

**Person Responsible**

Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)



|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>#5</b>   |   |
| <b>Title</b>  | Conditions for Learning   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Our current level performance in 64% of students feel they are treated fairly, as evidenced by the student survey results from the Advanced Ed Student Survey. Our expected level of performance is 75% of students feel they are treated fairly as evidenced by the Advanced Ed Student Survey. The problem/gap is occurring because students do not feel a strong connection with an adult on Bauder's campus. If Restorative Practices are implemented with fidelity by all staff, we believe we will see an increase in students' feeling as though they are treated fairly.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | By May, 2020, the percent of students feeling as though they are treated fairly will increase from 64% to 75%, as measured by the Advanced Ed Student Survey.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Strengthen the ability of all staff to fully implement Restorative Practices to ensure that positive relationships are established and maintained. Restorative Practices will be fully implemented throughout the school to ensure that all staff and students resolve conflict in appropriate ways. Positive relationships for students will ensure they want to come to school and learn.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Support and development of school-wide ownership of equitable practices ensures an environment that engages students in learning.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 100% of Support staff will receive Restorative Practices trained delivered by a trained facilitator, by the end of first quarter, 2019.</li> <li>2. Administrators will ensure professional development on Trauma-Informed Care is provided for all staff.</li> <li>3. Teachers will participate and lead restorative circles, modeling and reinforcing restorative communication and actions.</li> <li>4. SBLT will review school-wide implementation findings for staff implementation of Restorative Practices and will use the findings to determine a plan of growth for the school and/or individual classrooms.</li> <li>5. Teachers will engage students in using a Data Folder to set goals and monitor progress, on a monthly basis.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>#6</b>  |  |
| <b>Title</b>   | Attendance<br>Our current attendance rate is 94% and we want to increase it to 96%.  |
| <b>Rationale</b>   | Our current level of performance in attendance is 6% students with less than 90% attendance, as measured through the Focus Student Information System. We expect our performance level to be 4% students with less than 90% attendance, as measured through the Focus Student Information System. The problem/gap is occurring because there is a lack of a positive reinforcement for those who improve their attendance. If a system for recognizing improvement would occur, the problem would be reduced by 2%.  |
| <b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | By May, 2020, the number of students with less than 90% attendance will decrease. By May, 2020, our overall attendance will improve to 96%.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                 | Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                   | A positive recognition system for students with improved attendance records provides students with incentives to continue to attend school.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                     | Based on 2018-2019 CST minutes, the 37 students who had less than 90% attendance had low attendance rates for 2 or more years in a row. Focusing on positive reinforcement will encourage students to attend school and to know that they are missed when they are absent.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>   |  |
| <b>Description</b>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. School Social Worker will develop and implement attendance incentive programs, competitions and improved attendance recognition programs.</li> <li>2. Teachers and Administrators will ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes.</li> <li>3. Child Study Team to engage families in problem-solving when attendance exceeds 10% of school days.</li> <li>4. Child Study Team to review data and effectiveness of school-wide attendance strategies.</li> <li>5. Teachers will contact families when student absence reaches 10% of daily attendance and record the information from families into the Focus portal.</li> <li>6. Child Study Team will implement Tier 2 and Tier 3 attendance strategies for students with specific needs.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>  | Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>#7</b>  |   |
| <b>Title</b>   | Family and Community Engagement   |
| <b>Rationale</b>   | Currently, we have a high number of families that participate in our various family/community events. We would like to increase the types of activities we offer to our families to capitalize on our families' cultures of origin. Bauder recognizes the impact celebrating our students' culture has on their learning.   |
| <b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | We currently host 2 family event nights and we will add one new family event night by May, 2020.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                 | Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                   | The school will engage all families and provide opportunities for families to be involved and support their child's academic success in school.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                     | As the demographics of Bauder are shifting, we want to celebrate the growing diversity and encourage our families to participate in more school activities and events.  |
| <b>Action Step</b>   |   |
| <b>Description</b>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Administrators and Teachers will effectively communicate with families about their child's progress and school processes/practices</li> <li>2. Family and Community Liaison will survey families to learn about the cultures each student represents in August, 2019.</li> <li>3. Administrators will engage families and the student multicultural committee in planning and implementing an event that incorporates cultures represented by our students.</li> <li>4. The Media Specialist will increase the postings on the Bauder Official Facebook page to ensure families have multiple means of learning about school activities.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>  | Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)  |

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| <b>#8</b>        |   |
| <b>Title</b>     | Healthy Schools   |
| <b>Rationale</b> | Currently, Bauder has not earned a Healthy Schools award. We expect our performance to be a 4 out of 6 Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program for the bronze level, as evidenced in the Alliance for a Healthier Generation Healthy Schools Program Assessment. The problem/gap is occurring because we have not made a focus on increasing physical activity as well as ensuring healthy snacks are served in the cafeteria. If we implement a Healthy Schools team to monitor the guidelines of the program, we should qualify for the bronze level award. |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | By May, 2020, 50% of staff will participate in at least one of the BE SMART wellness programs.              |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | John Baker (bakerjoh@pcsb.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful and strategies that transfer to the students. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | This strategy will support development of traits for increased health.                                      |

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Action Step</b>        |   |
| <b>Description</b>        | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assemble a Healthy School Team made up of a minimum of 4 individuals including, but not limited to: PE/Health Teacher; Classroom Teacher, Wellness Champion, Administrator, Cafeteria Manager, Parent, Student</li> <li>2. Healthy School Team to complete the Healthy School Program assessment by September, 2019.</li> <li>3. Attend district supported professional development.</li> <li>4. Complete the Smart Snacks in School assessment.</li> <li>5. Healthy School Team will develop Healthy School Program action plan.</li> <li>6. Students will receive the More Health presentations at least once per year.</li> <li>7. Wellness Champion will facilitate a presentation on Stress Management to teachers.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b> | Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)  |

**#9****Title** Gifted Students**Rationale**

In 2018-2019 our percentage of gifted learners earning a Level 4/5 on the FSA ELA assessment was 74.3%. This was a decrease from 79.2% in 2017-2018. In 2018-2019, our percentage of gifted learners earning a Level 4/5 on the FSA Math assessment was 81.4%. This was a decrease from 90.6% in 2017-2018. The problem/gap is occurring because lessons are not being differentiated to ensure gifted learners can demonstrate mastery of standards at the appropriate level of complexity. If differentiation of instruction would occur, the problem would be reduced by 9%.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve**

By May, 2020, the percent of gifted learners achieving ELA Level 4/5 will increase from 74.3% to 80% as measured by the 2020 FSA ELA assessment. By May, 2020, the percent of gifted learners achieving Math Level 4/5 will increase from 81.4% to 90%, as measured by the 2020 FSA MATH assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy**

Facilitate consistent and sustained professional development with a focus on strategies for differentiation for gifted learners and cluster group gifted and talented learners.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

The research on gifted learners supports cluster grouping when paired with gifted knowledgeable teachers and differentiation has been shown to better meet the needs of gifted learners and provide opportunities for growth.

**Action Step****Description**

1. Teachers will obtain gifted micro-credential and/or the gifted certification so that they can better differentiate for gifted learners.
2. Administrators will cluster group gifted and talented students so that the process of differentiation is more effective for gifted learners.
3. Teachers collaborate and intentionally plan for differentiation for gifted learners.
4. Administrators will monitor teacher practice and provide specific, actionable feedback to ensure differentiation for gifted learners.
5. Allow gifted students to utilize "curriculum compacting" as a means for differentiation and scaffolding.
6. Pace learning for gifted learners in response to student's individual needs.
7. Differentiate for gifted learners through adapting content, thinking skills, resources, and/or objectives.
8. Teachers attend ongoing, sustained professional development on "differentiation for gifted learners".
9. Administrators to recommend that Deliberate Practice Plans incorporate opportunities for growth in the area of differentiating for gifted learners.

**Person Responsible**

Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@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**

| <b>1</b>   | <b>III.A</b>            | <b>Areas of Focus: ELA/Reading</b>                                  |                          |     |            | <b>\$3,200.00</b> |
|--|-------------------------|---|--------------------------|-----|------------|-------------------|
| Function   | Object                  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source           | FTE | 2019-20    |                   |
|  | 140-Substitute Teachers | 0151 - Bauder Elementary School                                     | School Improvement Funds |     | \$2,700.00 |                   |
| <i>Notes: Provide TDEs to ensure classroom teachers can attend Data Analysis Meetings in all content areas three times a year.</i> |                         |   |                          |     |            |                   |
|  |                         | 0151 - Bauder Elementary School                                     | General Fund             |     | \$500.00   |                   |
| <i>Notes: Supplemental Curricular Materials</i>  |                         |   |                          |     |            |                   |
| <b>2</b>   | <b>III.A</b>            | <b>Areas of Focus: Math</b>   |                          |     |            | <b>\$250.00</b>   |
| Function   | Object                  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source           | FTE | 2019-20    |                   |
|  |                         | 0151 - Bauder Elementary School                                     | School Improvement Funds |     | \$250.00   |                   |
| <i>Notes: Supplemental Curricular materials</i>  |                         |   |                          |     |            |                   |
| <b>3</b>   | <b>III.A</b>            | <b>Areas of Focus: Science</b>                                      |                          |     |            | <b>\$250.00</b>   |
| Function   | Object                  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source           | FTE | 2019-20    |                   |
|  |                         | 0151 - Bauder Elementary School                                     | School Improvement Funds |     | \$250.00   |                   |
| <i>Notes: Supplemental Curricular Materials</i>  |                         |   |                          |     |            |                   |
| <b>4</b>   | <b>III.A</b>            | <b>Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap (Black Student Achievement)</b> |                          |     |            | <b>\$0.00</b>     |
| <b>5</b>   | <b>III.A</b>            | <b>Areas of Focus: Conditions for Learning</b>                      |                          |     |            | <b>\$0.00</b>     |
| <b>6</b>   | <b>III.A</b>            | <b>Areas of Focus: Attendance</b>                                   |                          |     |            | <b>\$0.00</b>     |
| <b>7</b>   | <b>III.A</b>            | <b>Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement</b>              |                          |     |            | <b>\$0.00</b>     |
| <b>8</b>   | <b>III.A</b>            | <b>Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools</b>                              |                          |     |            | <b>\$300.00</b>   |
| Function   | Object                  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source           | FTE | 2019-20    |                   |
|  |                         | 0151 - Bauder Elementary School                                     | General Fund             |     | \$300.00   |                   |
| <i>Notes: Student incentives and rewards.</i>  |                         |   |                          |     |            |                   |

|               |              |  |                   |
|---------------|--------------|--|-------------------|
| <b>9</b>      | <b>III.A</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Gifted Students</b> | <b>\$0.00</b>     |
| <b>Total:</b> |              |  | <b>\$4,000.00</b> |