Pinellas County Schools

Curtis Fundamental Elementary

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Curtis Fundamental Elementary

531 BELTREES ST, Dunedin, FL 34698

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

Demographics

Principal: Richard Knight

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2018-19 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	16%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 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	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 staff of Curtis Fundamental Elementary will partner with students, parents, and the community to create and maintain a quality and safe learning environment enabling each student to succeed.

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
Knight, Richard	Principal
Principal	
Baird, Molly	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Johnson, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Jolliffe, Heidi	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
Miklos, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Rizzo, Joyce	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Wood, Sari	SAC Member
SAC Member	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/1/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	82%	54%	57%	76%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	81%	59%	58%	56%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	79%	54%	53%	43%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	86%	61%	63%	90%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	78%	61%	62%	70%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	48%	51%	58%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	78%	53%	53%	82%	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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (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)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

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	78%	56%	22%	58%	20%
	2018	83%	53%	30%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	56%	28%	58%	26%
	2018	69%	51%	18%	56%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	84%	54%	30%	56%	28%
	2018	76%	50%	26%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	82%	62%	20%	62%	20%
	2018	94%	62%	32%	62%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	64%	26%	64%	26%
	2018	88%	62%	26%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	88%	60%	28%	60%	28%
	2018	88%	61%	27%	61%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	76%	54%	22%	53%	23%
	2018	82%	57%	25%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	53	80	70	58	40	36					
BLK	50			90							

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
HSP	74	90		78	60						
MUL	79			100							
WHT	84	80	79	86	77	64	79				
FRL	65	86		76	82		69				

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	35			52	27						
BLK	53	33		67	58						
HSP	67			80							
MUL	85			100							
WHT	79	56	50	91	71	58	87				
FRL	63	44	35	76	61	50	65				

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	79
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	551
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	70
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	76
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	90
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	78
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	76
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

Fifth Grade Math L25 Learning Gains (57%). Weak foundational skills displayed by the students identified as L25 in Math. Weak foundational reading skills (comprehension) for students identified as L25 in Math. Based on the 2018-2019 data, our L25 students scored lowest in the category of Measurement, Data and Geometry. Trend data shows that students who scored a level 1 (9 students) on the 2017-2018 FSA ELA, 4 of those students scored a level 1 (2 students) or 2 (2 students) on the 2018-2019 FSA Math.

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

The greatest decline from last year to this year was in FSA Mathematics. As a school we went from 90% in 2017-2018 to 86% in 2018-2019.

By grade level Trend by grades
2018 2019 2018 2019
3rd 94 82 3rd to 4th 94 90
4th 88 90 4th to 5th 88 88
5th 88 88

Contributing factors include low scores in the area of Measurement, Data and Geometry. Teachers report weak vocabulary development and knowledge in the area of Measurement, Data and Geometry.

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 2018-2019 data shows a positive gap from the state in the areas of ELA and Science (25 points). In ELA, an intense focus on differentiation during class as well as many before and after school programs focusing on L25 students and struggling students through the use of iReady and grade level standards. In science, student data was disaggregated from the 5th grade diagnostic assessments and students groups were formed after school to focus on 3rd and 4th grade standards as well as science vocabulary that were needed.

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

The area of most improvement from the 2017-2018 school year to the 2018-2019 school year is in the number of L25 students making Learning Gains in ELA. The data improved from 43% in 2018 to 79% in 2019. An intense focus on differentiation during class as well as many before and after school programs focusing on L25 students and struggling students through the use of iReady and grade level standards.

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

Based on data from the 2018-2019 school year our area of concern is absences. Last year we had 3% (17 students) absent 10% or more.

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

1. Increase the number of L25 students making learning gains in math.
2. Increase the number of 4th and 5th grade students scoring 70% or higher on the Text-Based writing on the 2019-2020 FSA ELA:
4th grade- 54 out of 88 students below 70% (2018-2019)
5th grade- 40 out of 88 students below 70% (2018-2019)
3. Increase the number of students scoring Level 3 and above on the 2019-2020 Science SSA.
4. Increase the number of students scoring Level 3 and above on the 2019-2020 3rd Grade ELA.
5. Increase the number of students scoring Level 3 and above on the 2019-2020 Math FSA.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA- Writing
Rationale	On the 2018-2019 Writing section (Text Based Writing) FSA ELA , 4th and 5th grade students scored the following: 4th grade- 54 out of 88 students (61%) below 70% (2018-2019) 5th grade- 40 out of 88 students (45%) below 70% (2018-2019)
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the number of 4th and 5th grade students scoring 70% or higher on the Text-Based Writing on the 2019-2020 FSA ELA from 47% to 60%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback. The most important component of the literacy block is ensuring ample time is given to students to read and write appropriate, grade level text and apply foundational skills, with high quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Increasing students opportunities to write will improve their reading comprehension. This strategy focuses on providing time for students to write text based responses based on grade level text. District writing assessments will be used to monitor student progress.
Action Step	
Description	1. During staff meeting, conduct cross grade level articulation to view writing samples and writing standards from each grade to show the progression of writing from K-5. 2. Staff training on instructional strategies that show how reading supports writing (example: annotating text and elaboration). 3. 3rd, 4th and 5th grade will attend after-school training on writing instruction. 4. Provide half-day TDE for 4th and 5th grade to plan for writing instruction after attending training using student work from their classrooms as a baseline. 5. Provide staff training on reinforcing the use of varied sentence structure and domain specific vocabulary. 6. Administration will monitor writing instruction by conducting focused walkthroughs and provide feedback on writing instruction.
Person Responsible	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Math
Rationale	The greatest decline from last year to this year was in FSA Mathematics. As a school we went from 90% in 2017-2018 to 86% in 2018-2019. By grade level Trend by grades 2018 2019 2018 2019 3rd 94 82 3rd to 4th 94 90 4th 88 90 4th to 5th 88 88 5th 88 88 Part of the decline in scores is attributed to L25 Math scores in grades 4 and 5 (67%). 4th Grade- 76% 5th Grade- 57%
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the number of 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students scoring Level 3 and above on the 2019-2020 FSA Math from 86% to 92%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Richard Knight (knightri@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, PLC's, and feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	With consideration of the new mathematics adoption, rigorous instruction will occur alongside focused support of the new math series.
Action Step	
Description	1. Half day TDE twice this year for grades K-5 for planning of new math adoption. 2. Delegating specific time during weekly PLC's to discuss and plan for mathematics instruction. 3. At Open House- parents will be given information on the new math adoption in their respective grade levels. 4. Staff will attend trainings at school and/or after school hours focusing on Dreambox and/or Number Routines and share at Weekly PLC's. 5. Math Data will be analyzed at monthly data chats Unit Assessments, lesson quizzes, digital quizzes, exit tickets, etc...).
Person Responsible	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science
Rationale	The percentage of 5th grade students scoring Level 3 and above decreased from 82% for the 2017-2018 school year to 76% for the 2018-2019 school year.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the number of students scoring Level 3 and above on the 2019-2020 SSSA Science Assessment from 76% to 82%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	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. 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	The Science assessment relies heavily on reading comprehension and vocabulary knowledge with an emphasis on domain specific vocabulary.
Action Step	
Description	1. K-5 science vocabulary articulation on-site training. 2. Start a science vocabulary journal that follow students from 3rd-5th grade based on state science domain words. 3. Expose all students (K-5) to science vocabulary by having science vocabulary words on morning news. 4. Use academic gaming to introduce and support science vocabulary development. 5. 4th and 5th grade use the unit assessments to identify low performing standards and adding low performing standards to the review plan in 5th grade.
Person Responsible	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Bridging the Gap (Black Student Achievement)- ELA
Rationale	43% of our African American students scored below a level 3 on the 2018-2019 FSA ELA assessment.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the number of African American students scoring a level 3 or above from 57% (4 students) to 80% (5 students).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure instructional supports are in place for African-American students are equitable and culturally relevant during core instruction and independent learning. These supports include access to grade level text and beyond as well as small group instruction for African-American students who score Level 1 or 2 on the ELA FSA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	On the 2018-2019 ELA FSA, our African American students (57%) scored below the average percentage of non-African American students.
Action Step	
Description	1. Continue Training and implementation of Restorative Practices in all classrooms. 2. Book study- Why Are All The Black Kids Sitting Together In The Cafeteria? 3. Equity with excellence training for staff (pre-school and ongoing). 4. School Based Mentor Program
Person Responsible	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	Conditions for Learning
Rationale	Decrease the number of behavior infractions issued from the classroom teachers and the cafeteria.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Reduce the number of behavior infractions issued from the classroom teachers and cafeteria staff from 341 for the 2018-2019 school year to 275 for the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Restorative Practices, Equity with Excellence, SEL, introduction to flow chart and Infraction Notification Form for ESE and 504 students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students. Strengthen the implementation of research-based practices that communicate high expectations for each student. Support the implementation engagement strategies that support the development of social and instructional teaching practices.
Action Step	
Description	1. Pre-School Training on Equity with Excellence 2. Pre-School Training on Restorative Practices 3. Introduce new forms to staff during Pre-School 4. Monitor and support staff for implementation and fidelity 5. PD on CRT strategies embedded in content throughout the year.
Person Responsible	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	3% of our student population is missing 10% or more for the 2018-2019 school year. Our daily rate was 96.6%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decrease the number of students missing 10% or more from 3% to 2%. Increase daily attendance rate from 96.6% to 98%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	CST Team will monitor absences at biweekly meetings.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Increase awareness of attendance and monitoring of students absences.
Action Step	
Description	1. Review CST data from last school year at first CST Meeting. 2. Review EWS data for absences at first CST Meeting. 3. Review attendance responsibilities with teachers. 4. Promote positive attendance and ties to academic performance on morning news.
Person Responsible	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Family & Community Engagement
Rationale	Partnerships with families and the community are an integral part of creating a positive school climate and assuring high academic achievement for students.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Meet requirements for attainment of The 5 Star Award.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure parents and community partners are aware of a variety of opportunities for involvement before, during and after school to support student success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Increase the number of volunteer hours and build and retain business partnerships from 3000 hours to 3500 hours.
Action Step	
Description	1. Training for families on logging volunteer hours. 2. Contact local businesses to partner with the school to provide volunteers and possible funding. 3. Hold volunteer breakfast/orientation at the beginning of the school year. 4. Set up a pick up point for volunteer activities. 5. Curriculum Nights (literacy, science, etc...) are incorporated into our monthly PTA Meetings.
Person Responsible	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	Increase healthy habits of all students.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students participating in activities to increase healthy habits will increase from 70% to 85%, as measured by the Healthy Schools Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Educators realize that a child's physical, emotional, social and mental health directly affects behaviors and learning.
Action Step	
Description	1. Provide professional Development for the staff in the areas of cafeteria, classroom, before school, after school and PTA related activities. 2. Implementation of Go Noodle, School Garden, Workout Wednesdays, Morning Running Club, Fitness Jar for students, staff and parents. 3. Staff will participate in a 6 hour Mental Health Training on campus during Pre-School.
Person Responsible	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	ESSA sub-groups
Rationale	Curtis does not have any ESSA Subgroups. All Subgroups were above 41% on the ESSA Report.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#10	
Title	Gifted
Rationale	55% of our 5th grade gifted students scored a level 4 and above on the 2018-2019 FSA Mathematics assessment.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	90% of our 5th grade gifted students will score a level 4 or above on the 2019-202 FSA Mathematic assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Richard Knight (knightri@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	PLC's for classroom teachers will be held on gifted days. Gifted teachers will attend weekly PLC meetings with 5th grade teachers to provide strategies, support to teachers as well as allow gifted teachers to support classroom teachers in the area of math during gifted instruction by being a part of the planning process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By allowing the gifted teachers to meet with not just 5th grade, but all classroom teachers, planning, interventions and support can be provided.
Action Step	
Description	1. Gifted teachers will meet with classroom teachers during weekly PLC's. 2. Monitor 5th grade gifted math scores on MAP, unit and classroom assessments. 3. Provide opportunities for 5th grade students to attend before/after-school programs to support math development (Dreambox, Might Mu). 4. Selection of challenging tasks for gifted students using Ready Mathematics differentiation resources. 5. Planning for high level questions to challenge gifted students.
Person Responsible	Richard Knight (knightri@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- Writing**				**$487.50**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

		140-Substitute Teachers	3131 - Curtis Fundamental Elementary	School Improvement Funds		$487.50
			Notes: Provide half-day TDE for 3rd, 4th and 5th grade teachers to plan for writing instruction.			
2	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Math**				**$2,100.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		140-Substitute Teachers	3131 - Curtis Fundamental Elementary	School Improvement Funds		$2,100.00
			Notes: Provide half-day TDE's for grades K-5 for planning of mathematics instruction.			
3	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Science**				**$0.00**
4	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap (Black Student Achievement)- ELA**				**$92.50**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		500-Materials and Supplies	3131 - Curtis Fundamental Elementary	School Improvement Funds		$92.50
			Notes: Funds used to purchase books (Why Are All The Black Kids Sitting Together In The Cafeteria) for book study.			
5	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Conditions for Learning**				**$0.00**
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: ESSA sub-groups**				**$0.00**
10	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Gifted**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$2,680.00**