# Curlew Creek Elementary School

**2019-20 School Improvement Plan**

# Table of Contents

# Curlew Creek Elementary School

3030 CURLEW RD, Palm Harbor, FL 34684

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

## Demographics

## Principal: Kathy Brickely

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2015

| | |
|---|---|
| **2018-19 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | No |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 43% |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Asian Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>Students With Disabilities<br>White Students |
| **School Grade** | 2018-19: A |
| **School Grades History** | 2017-18: C |
| | 2016-17: A |
| | 2015-16: B |
| | 2014-15: A |
| | 2013-14: C |
| **2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Tracy Webley |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N |
| **Year** | A |
| **ESSA Status** | 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.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

# Part I: School Information

## School Mission and Vision

### Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Curlew Creek Elementary is to prepare students for Middle School, High School,
College and Career by fostering positive relationships while providing rigorous and engaging
learning experiences.

### Provide the school's vision statement

Vision: 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 |
|------|-------|
| Brickley, Kathleen | Principal |
| Principal | |
| Cehi, Mary Sue | Assistant Principal |
| Assistant Principal | |
| Hajian, Michelle | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Ellis, Jeremy | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Essex, Melissa | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Scalia, Nichole | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Wright, Dina | Teacher, ESE |
| Teacher, ESE | |
| Brooks, Michelle | 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 | 58 | 95 | 94 | 110 | 107 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 565 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 7 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 21 | 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 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

**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 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**
45

**Date this data was collected or last updated**
Wednesday 7/10/2019

**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 | 15 | 16 | 21 | 19 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 19 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 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 | 67% | 54% | 57% | 56% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 68% | 59% | 58% | 39% | 47% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 67% | 54% | 53% | 29% | 40% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 71% | 61% | 63% | 72% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 75% | 61% | 62% | 63% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 48% | 51% | 38% | 42% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 71% | 53% | 53% | 64% | 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 | 58 (0) | 95 (0) | 94 (0) | 110 (0) | 107 (0) | 101 (0) | 565 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 () | 7 () | 11 () | 12 () | 10 () | 7 () | 47 (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) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (0) | 18 (0) | 21 (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 | 63% | 56% | 7% | 58% | 5% |
|  | 2018 | 53% | 53% | 0% | 57% | -4% |
| Same Grade Comparison |  | 10% |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04 | 2019 | 63% | 56% | 7% | 58% | 5% |
|  | 2018 | 63% | 51% | 12% | 56% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison |  | 0% |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |  | 10% |  |  |  |  |
| 05 | 2019 | 83% | 54% | 29% | 56% | 27% |
|  | 2018 | 57% | 50% | 7% | 55% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison |  | 26% |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |  | 20% |  |  |  |  |

## MATH

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 03 | 2019 | 66% | 62% | 4% | 62% | 4% |
|  | 2018 | 65% | 62% | 3% | 62% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison |  | 1% |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04 | 2019 | 72% | 64% | 8% | 64% | 8% |
|  | 2018 | 82% | 62% | 20% | 62% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison |  | -10% |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |  | 7% |  |  |  |  |
| 05 | 2019 | 85% | 60% | 25% | 60% | 25% |
|  | 2018 | 77% | 61% | 16% | 61% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison |  | 8% |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |  | 3% |  |  |  |  |

## SCIENCE

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 05 | 2019 | 74% | 54% | 20% | 53% | 21% |
|  | 2018 | 65% | 57% | 8% | 55% | 10% |
| Same Grade Comparison |  | 9% |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Subgroup Data

### 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SWD | 38 | 50 | 64 | 50 | 71 | 64 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 38 | 53 |  | 48 | 59 |  | 55 |  |  |  |  |

### 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ASN | 73 |  |  | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HSP | 48 | 76 |  | 55 | 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MUL | 59 | 50 |  | 73 | 71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 71 | 69 | 67 | 75 | 78 | 58 | 74 |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 57 | 62 | 65 | 59 | 68 | 48 | 56 |  |  |  |  |

### 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 | 20 | 28 |  | 30 | 33 |  | 30 |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 35 | 47 |  | 50 | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASN | 75 |  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HSP | 38 | 32 |  | 61 | 57 |  | 53 |  |  |  |  |
| MUL | 73 |  |  | 73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 58 | 37 | 22 | 73 | 62 | 39 | 66 |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 44 | 34 | 29 | 61 | 51 | 35 | 46 |  |  |  |  |

## 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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 67 |
| 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 | 67 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 534 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 56 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 53 |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| 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 | 77 |
| 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 | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 63 |
| 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 | 66 |
| 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 | 60 |
| 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**

Math L25 learninng gains. Lack of participation in extended learning programs for 4th grade L25 students. Need additional focus on this area during PLCs.

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

Overall mathematics proficiency declined one point, 72 to 71.
Grade 4 math profiency declined 10 points, 82 to 72, however when comparing those students they increased 7 points from 65 to 72.

**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**

School proficiency exceeds district and state averages. Mathematics L25 learning gains was just a few points above these averages. Although a ten point increase from previous year, this area continues to be a goal.

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

Grade 5 ELA proficiency +26: Each 5th grade teacher had morning ELP tutoring for their L25 students. Teachers adjusted and used the module materials based on their student/class needs, such as shorten whole class core instruction and increase small group and independent practice with monitoring and feedback. Intervention block consisted of small group instruction using Florida Ready.
ELA overall learning gains +29:
ELA L25 learning gains +38

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

Attendance below 90% (47) (need to reduce from 13% to uner 10%)
Level 1 FSA (41)
Students with 2 or more EW indicators (11)

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

1. L25 Mathematics (38-48)
2. Grade 4 ELA (63-63)
3. Grade 4 Math (82-72)
4. Grade 3 Math (65-66)
5. ELL

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | ELA |
| **Rationale** | Our current level of performance is 69%, as evidenced by 2019 ELA FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because students lack the stamina to independently read and write for an extended period of time. If students have ample opportunities to develop stamina, student proficiency will increase. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 69% to 74% as measured by FSA. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Ensure instructional supports (access to grade level and advanced resources, small group instruction, and timely productive feedback) are in place for all students during instruction and independence, including supports for ESE, ELL, and gifted students. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | According to grade level data and observations, students would benefit from access to grade level and advanced resources to build stamina and proficiency. |
| **Action Step** | |
| **Description** | 1. Teachers align instruction to meet the Florida Standards for ELA, district curriculum guidelines and students needs by providing multiple opportunities across the literacy block for reading, writing, speaking, and listening. <br> 2. Teachers will utilize instructional methods that promote inquiry and student autnomy. <br> 3. Teachers provide opportunities for students to practice the targeted skills through authentic independent or group activities with student accountability and teacher targeted actionable feedback. <br> 4. Conduct regular Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and plan for instruction based on data. <br> 5. Teachers will develop together and utilize exemplars to set student expectations for reading and writing. <br> 6. Utilize small group methods (such as guided reading, strategy lessons, and book clubs) to meet the unique needs of students. <br> 7. Grades 1 and 2 will utilize with fidelity the Fun with Phonics program provided by PCS. |
| **Person Responsible** | Linda Petersen (petersenli@pcsb.org) |

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Math |
| **Rationale** | Our current level of proficiency is 74%, as evidenced in 2019 Math FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because differentiation is not occurring to meet the needs of our L25 students. If more intentional differentiation and targeted small group instruction would occur, the problem would be reduced by an increase in the number of L25 students showing proficiency on the Math FSA. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | The percent of all third, fourth, and fifth grade students showing proficiency will increase from 74% to 78% as measured by the Math FSA. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | 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 empowering mathematics teacher leaders to facilitate alongside administrators. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | According to data and observations, students would benefit from more rigorous instruction and differentiation, and teachers would benefit from increased professional development to implement student-centered instruction and differentiation. |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | 1. Participate in Math Teacher Leader Institute.<br>2. Conduct regular curriculum staff meetings to support teacher use of Ready Classroom Mathematics and Dreambox Learning to support student learning.<br>3. Conduct grade level PLCs led by mathematics teacher leaders to support teachers in providing differentiation and student-centered learning using complex tasks.<br>4. Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention, and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance.<br>5. Teachers will maintain a focus on implementing Number Routines to support foundational math skills and to use as an ongoing assessment tool.<br>6. Provide Extended Learning Program opportunities for L25 students to receive additional instruction and differentiation. |
| **Person Responsible** | Michelle Hajian (hajianm@pcsb.org) |

| #3 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Science |
| **Rationale** | 5th grade students need to increase proficiency on the Science Assessment. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | The percent of 5th grade students achieving science proficiency will increase from 74% to 77%, as measured by SSA. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Develop, implement and monitor a data driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th Grade Diagnostic Assessment. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | After a review of the SSA Data, we determined a greater focus is needed on certain 3rd and 4th Grade standards. |
| 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 academic vocabulary.<br><br>2. Conduct regular Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and plan for instruction based on data.<br><br>3. Conduct cross grade level articulation PLCs each unit (Earth, Life, Physical) to discuss science standards and grade level expectations.<br><br>4. Monitor for consistent effective instruction that promotes student centered instruction with rigor for all science labs in grades 1-5.<br><br>5. Grades 4 and 5 will complete unit assessments and use data to determine low proficiency grade level standards. Grade 5 will add low proficency grade level standards to their review plan for 3rd and 4th grade standards. |
| **Person Responsible** | Jeremy Ellis (ellisjer@pcsb.org) |

| #4 | |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | Bridging the Gap |
| **Rationale** | Our current level of performance of our black students is 25% proficient on ELA FSA, as evidenced in FSA 2019. We expect our performance level to be 50% by May 2020. The problem/gap is occurring because of a lack of culturally relevant instructional strategies. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | The percent of black students achieving proficiency on ELA FSA will increase from 25% to 50%, as measured by FSA 2020. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | If staff is able to meet the needs of each student through differentiation and scaffolding, students will achieve proficiency. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans. <br> 2. Implement Restorative Practices throughout the school. <br> 3. Ultilize supports from district office to ensure interventions are in place and being implemented for black students who receive consent for evaluation. <br> 4. Ultilize supports from district office to support the recruitment and retention of black applicants. |
| **Person Responsible** | Mary Sue Cehi (cehim@pcsb.org) |

| #5 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Conditions for Learning |
| **Rationale** | Our current level of performance is 39 referrals from 19 students. We expect our referral level to decrease. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | The number of referrals will decrease from to 39 to 25. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Mary Sue Cehi (cehim@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Ensure that the academic, social-emotional, and behavioral needs of each and every student are known and met. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | If the needs of each and every student are known and met, then students will have fewer behavior incidents. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Conduct and continually improve on RP circles on a daily basis. 2. Increase the number of teachers that are AVID CRT trained. 3. Conduct monthly schoolwide PCS Tier 1 PBIS Walkthrough with RP elements to review staff implementation. 4. Reorganize SBLT meetings to include RP trainer, PBIS leader, CRT representative, and equity representative. 5. Develop a level 2 behavior data tracking process. 6. Equity champions will provide an all staff learning module. 7. Develop an in-house mentor program for our L25 behavior and academic students. 8. Develop a plan to support students who receive multiple referrals. |
| **Person Responsible** | Kathy Genens (genensk@pcsb.org) |

| #6 | |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | Attendance |
| **Rationale** | Our current attendance rate is 95%. Our goal is to increase to 97%. The current percent of students missing more than 10% of school is 11%. Our goal is to decrease to 8%. The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because there is a lack of understanding of the importance of school attendance. If a stronger emphasis on understanding the importance of attendance would occur, the problem would be reduced by 3%. We have a population of students in our school who have severe medical needs, which causes them to have a high absence rate. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | The percent of all students missing more than 10% of school will decrease from 11% to 8% as measured by daily attendance. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Increase awareness of the importance of attendance for staff and families and utilize incentives for attendance. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | If parents and families understand the importance of attending school, then students' attendance rate will improve. |
| **Action Step** | |
| **Description** | 1. Conduct monthly class celebrations for classes with the best attendance. 2. Give incentives for students with perfect attendance. 3. Engage students and families in attendance related activities to ensure they are knowledgeable of the data and aware of the importance of attendance. 4. With our targeted population we will monitor, plan, and communicate with parents starting at the beginning of the school year. |
| **Person Responsible** | Mary Sue Cehi (cehim@pcsb.org) |

| #7 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Family & Community Engagement |
| **Rationale** | 30% of families participated in family engagement activities in the 2018/2019 school year. Family engagement impacts student learning and success.<br>-Increase family engagement with a focus on curriculum<br>-Ensure families are aware of academic expectations to increase student achievement |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | We will increase the percentage of families attending family engagement events from 30% to 50% in the 2019/2020 school year. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Provide academic tools to families in support of their students' achievement. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | As reported in surveys, families would like to continue to receive support and tools to support their students' achievement at home and at school. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Plan and deliver grade level specific curriculum nights to inform parents of school/class processes, curriculum expectations, assessments, and to provide parents with information and tools to support their child's education at home.<br>2. Participate in Parent Conferences (parent/teacher, student-led)<br>3. Plan and deliver content area specific family nights events (Family Literacy, Mathnasium, Science Olympiad) to provide parents with information and tools to support their child's education at home.<br>4. Plan and deliver events that build positive relationships with families.<br>5. Ensure sign-in sheets are available and utilized at all family events.<br>6. Provide an orientation to all volunteers to include instruction on how to track volunteer hours in Focus. |
| **Person Responsible** | Nichole Scalia (scalian@pcsb.org) |

| #8 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Healthy Schools |
| **Rationale** | Our current level of performance is Silver level, as evidenced in the Alliance for a Healthier Generation assessment. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | Our school will be eligible in 6 out of 6 modules for bronze/silver/gold recognition by April 2020 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Framework. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Mary Sue Cehi (cehim@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | We will continue to focus on the six healthy school modules. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | Focusing on the six healthy school modules will maintain the Silver status. Conflict with food profit making events prevents us from moving past silver. |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | 1. Assemble a Healthy School Team made up of a minimum of four (4) individuals including, but not limited to: PE Teacher/Health Teacher, Classroom Teacher, Wellness Champion, Administrator, Cafeteria Manager, Parent, and Student.<br><br>2. Attend district-supported professional development.<br><br>3. Develop and Implement Healthy School Program Action Plan.<br><br>4. Update Healthy Schools Program Assessment and Apply for Recognition. |
| **Person Responsible** | Dina Wright (wrightdi@pcsb.org) |

| #9 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Gifted students |
| **Rationale** | Learning gain trend data has been inconsistent.<br>67.3% of Gifted students scored a level 4 or 5 on 2018-19 ELA FSA.<br>83.7% of Gifted studnes scored a level 4 or 5 on 2018-19 Math FSA.<br>We are below the district (73%) and state (82%) average in ELA. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | 82% or more of gifted students will score a level 4 or 5 in ELA on the 2019-20 FSA.<br>85% or more of gifted students will score a level 4 or 5 in Math on the 2019-20 FSA. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Cluster grouping |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | Research 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. Intentional cluster grouping of gifted learners in grades 4 & 5<br>2. Teachers earning gifted micro-credential and/or gifted endorsement<br>3. Intentional differentiation for gifted learners<br>4. Use of ELA Module Extensions for above grade level learners<br>5. PD for differentiation of the modules for 4th and 5th grade teachers |
| **Person Responsible** | Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@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)**

na

## Part V: Budget

| 1 | III.A | **Areas of Focus: ELA** | | | | **$2,300.00** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 6400 | 140-Substitute Teachers | 0851 - Curlew Creek Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | $2,300.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Substitutes for teams/teachers to have a TDE for curriculum planning, PD, and observations.* | | | |
| 2 | III.A | **Areas of Focus: Math** | | | | **$400.00** |

| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5100 | 100-Salaries | 0851 - Curlew Creek Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | $400.00 |
| | | | Notes: School Improvement Planning stipends | | | |
| **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: Conditions for Learning** | | | | **$200.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 6300 | 510-Supplies | 0851 - Curlew Creek Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | $200.00 |
| | | | Notes: Books for Teacher Equity Book Study | | | |
| **6** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Attendance** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **7** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Family & Community Engagement** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **8** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **9** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Gifted students** | | | | **$0.00** |
| | | | | | **Total:** | **$2,900.00** |