Leila Davis Elementary School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Leila Davis Elementary School

2630 LANDMARK DR, Clearwater, FL 33761

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

Demographics

Principal: William Durst

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 PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	37%
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 English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: C 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 mission of Leila G. Davis Elementary is to prepare students for middle school by providing a nurturing and academically challenging education through the unified efforts of the total school community.

Provide the school's vision statement

Leila G. Davis Elementary will exceed county and state expectations as one of the top elementary schools in Pinellas County devoted to highest student achievement, character development, and individual success.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Durst, William	Principal
Principal	
Gualtieri, Kathryn Gualtieri	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	122	125	88	135	105	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	697
Attendance below 90 percent	0	18	6	12	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
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	5	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	7	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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

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

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	1	3	2	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)
47

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 7/17/2019

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	24	14	18	21	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
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	5	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	22	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	7	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	69%	54%	57%	60%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	59%	58%	39%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	54%	53%	31%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	74%	61%	63%	64%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	69%	61%	62%	58%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	48%	51%	45%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	64%	53%	53%	68%	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	122 (0)	125 (0)	88 (0)	135 (0)	105 (0)	122 (0)	697 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	18 ()	6 ()	12 ()	6 ()	16 ()	58 (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)	5 (0)	1 (0)	8 (0)	14 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	7 (0)	21 (0)	30 (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	75%	56%	19%	58%	17%
	2018	72%	53%	19%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	56%	10%	58%	8%
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
	2018	57%	50%	7%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	79%	62%	17%	62%	17%
	2018	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	64%	9%	64%	9%
	2018	58%	62%	-4%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	67%	60%	7%	60%	7%
	2018	62%	61%	1%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	62%	54%	8%	53%	9%
	2018	66%	57%	9%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	52	61	69	45	61	63	43				
ELL	56	65		56	70		55				
BLK	40	46		50	77		45				
HSP	59	78	58	65	70	60	74				
MUL	55			64							
WHT	73	68	67	77	69	62	66				
FRL	52	57	53	58	58	50	45				

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	49	25	40	38	39	33	71				
ELL	46	37	36	67	47						
ASN	69			62							
BLK	32	35		50	30		50				
HSP	55	41		59	54		68				
MUL	47	18		44	55						
WHT	64	39	33	68	62	50	71				
FRL	43	32	20	54	54	45	56				

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	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	539
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	63
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	
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	52
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	67
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	60
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	70
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	56
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

Learning Gains in Mathematics and English Language Arts for our lowest 25%. The performance numbers of our L25 students grew considerably from the previous year, however an evaluation of our intervention blocks indicated a school-wide need for fidelity of time, the effectiveness of prescribed intervention, and use of data to make necessary changes in the actual intervention used in reading.

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

Science - two new 5th grade teachers to grade level, one started 2nd 9-weeks, New science adoption, Science SLAGS need to be supplemented, tracking of standards and large concepts over the years, and development of comprehensive review of 3rd & 4th grade standards.

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

Presently Davis continues to perform above the state average in all content areas.

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

ELA/Math Learning gains and proficiency. 1) Entire school clustered based on academic need (gifted, ESE, EL, high-performing, low-performing, on grade level, Tier 2/3, etc.) 2) "Push In" service model for VE Resource teachers. 3) Purposeful and focused PLC's and Collaborative Planning Hubs 4) School-wide alignment of standards-based teaching and planning 5) Extensive progress-monitoring and creating action plans in response to data trends and performance. 6) Use of growth data from Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for student growth goal-setting. 7) Prominent display of grade level and classroom growth data that was used in conversations with students. 8) Administrative schedule and focus built around instructional needs and supports in the classroom 9) Timely coaching support in all content areas.

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

1. Attendance in 3rd and 5th grade
2. Number level 1's in 5th grade

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

1. View all work through an Equitable Lens
2. Reading Intervention
3. Science
4. Math Intervention

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Instruction and Intervention
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 69%, as evidenced in FSA 2019. We expect our performance level to be 80% by 2020 FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because of a misalignment of learning target to student-centered task alignment with ample practice at the complexity level of the standard and fidelity of reading intervention time/block. With greater alignment of instructional practices, the problem would be reduced by 11%

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 69% to 75%, as measured by 2020 FSA. Overall Student Learning Gains will increase from 68% to 75%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	-Facilitate ELA-focused, consistent and sustained professional development with a focus on standards-based instruction, target and task alignment, and the shifts (Regular practice with complex texts and academic language; Reading, writing, & speaking grounded in evidence from texts; Building knowledge through content-rich nonfiction) -Intervention time will be used to remediate and enrich standards to our students. Our lowest 35% . . . . VE Resource teachers will implement small group instruction using the inclusion model so that ESE students are exposed to grade level standards and text. Students who have mastered the standards will be provided wigth enrichment so that he/she can be challenged during intervention time.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To support 100% success rate of all students and our L25 students receive individualized ELA instruction to ensure academic learning gains. Evidence is based on MAP scores, module assessments, and ISIP.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will ensure students have ample time every day to practice independently what was taught in reading and writing, allowing for strategic practice as well as building stamina for longer and longer reading and writing tasks across the grade levels as well as the calendar year. 2. Intervention time will be used to reteach standards with targeted skills to students who are struggling academically. ESE Resource teachers will implement small group instruction using the inclusion model so that ESE students are exposed to grade level standards and text. Students who have mastered the standards will receive enrichment so that he/she can be challenged during intervention time. 3. Grade Level ELA teachers will use student data to group students, plan and deliver differentiated instruction. 4. Teachers will help students become critical thinkers, write and talk in

response to text, read fiction and nonfiction and write and talk around the text. Teachers will use strategies listed in Domain 3 of the Marzano framework.

5. Use of MAP and OPM standards performance data to communicate progress with all stakeholders. (Data walls in main hallway, classrooms, individual student data portfolios, and via parent communication folders)

6. School-wide implementation of student data folders will occur for goal-setting and articulation.

7. Teachers and administration participate in weekly collaborative planning hubs to create rich tasks/activities with an emphasized focus on daily learning target to student task alignment. formative assessments that are aligned to specific standards performance.

Person Responsible	William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Math Instruction and Intervention
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 74%, as evidenced in 2019 FSA. We expect our performance level to be 80% by 2020 FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because of inconsistent target/task alignment and planning of student-centered rich math tasks. If the daily learning target and task are aligned and students are engaged in frequent student-centered task work, the problem would be reduced by 6%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving Mathematics proficiency will increase from 74% to 80%, as measured by 2020 FSA. Overall student Learning Gains will increase from 69% to 75% and our L25 gains will increase from 60% to 75%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kathryn Gualtieri Gualtieri (gualtierik@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready Classroom Mathematics and Dreambox Learning. We will support this work through curriculum meetings, PLCs, feedback in iObservation, and RigorWalks by teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To support 100% success rate of all students and our L25 students receive individualized Math instruction to ensure academic learning gains. Evidence is based on MAP scores, progress-monitoring assessments, and Dreambox progress.
Action Step	
Description	1. Facilitate mathematics-focused, consistent and sustained professional development through monthly curriculum meetings and weekly PLCs. Empower mathematics teacher leaders to facilitate alongside administrators. 2. Utilize multiple forms of assessment to inform instruction, including Unit Assessments, Exit Tickets, MFAS and Illustrative Mathematics tasks, and/or "in the moment" student work analysis. Use student work to guide analysis of student learning in grade level PLCs. 3. Ensure feedback, professional development, and PLCs align with the Key Shifts in Mathematics [Focus, Coherence, Rigor] and promote strong alignment between standard, target, and task. 4. Teachers and administration participate in weekly collaborative planning hubs to create rich student-centered tasks/activities and formative assessments that are aligned to specific standards performance. 5. Use of MAP and OPM standards performance data to communicate progress with all stakeholders. (Data walls in main hallway, classrooms, individual student data portfolios, and via parent communication folders) 6. School-wide implementation of student data folders will occur for goal-setting and articulation.
Person Responsible	Kathryn Gualtieri Gualtieri (gualtierik@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science Instruction
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 64% proficient, as evidenced by the State Science Assessment (SSA). We expect our performance level to be 80 by April 2020. The problem/gap is occurring because of teacher planning and instruction. If high leveraged strategies that support Standards-Based Planning and Instruction would occur, the problem would be reduced by 16%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 64% to 80%, as measured by 2020 SSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	William Durst (durstw@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	To accurately target a review from 3rd and 4th grade standards that indicate a need for remediation. This review of science standards will be differentiated for each learner.

Action Step	
Description	1. 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. 2. Support and utilize formal and informal assessment strategies that inform instruction. Identify proficiency levels and implement instructional strategies to increase conceptual development of key content. 3. Develop, implement and monitor a data driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th Grade Diagnostic Assessment. 4. Monitor for consistent effective instruction that promotes student-centered science instruction with rigor for all grades 1-5. 5. Implement unit assessments in 4/5 grade. Identify low performing standards and incorporate into review plan with 3rd and 4th grade standards review. 6. Utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model (10% setting the purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) and include appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignment to the 1st – 5th grade standards.
Person Responsible	William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Bridging the Gap - Black Student Achievement
Rationale	Black students are currently meeting the ESSA federal index proficiency. Our current level of performance is 59% scoring level 1 or 2 in ELA and 46% scoring level 1 or 2 in Mathematics, as evidenced in 2019 FSA.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Reduce numbers of students achieving Level 1 on the Florida Standards Assessment from 59% to 40% in ELA and 46% to 30% in Mathematics by May 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Continually review performance data and classroom instruction through an equity lens to ensure our black students are receiving the necessary and equitable supports to succeed. 2. Intentional plan culturally responsive content. 3. Use of data chats to analyze black student performance through an equitable lens.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our Black students perform at lower levels of proficiency with 59% scoring a level 1 or 2 in ELA and 46% in Mathematics, as measured by the 2019 FSA. A need exists to intentionally frame conversations around black student performance in all content areas. Intentional action plans that focus on inclusion of culturally relevant material with familial supports and communication will help close the performance gap.

Action Step	
Description	1. Equity Champions will serve as a resource when data is disaggregated and will help develop action plans to address any gaps in performance. 2. 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. Black students will be more engaged in learning, motivated to complete work and develop stronger relationships with teachers and classmates. This will lead to improved scores in ELA, especially in writing, where these students tend to struggle. 3. Ensure black students are participating in extended learning opportunities before and after school and in extended school year programs through recruitment and targeted resources. By ensuring black students' participation in ELA and Math ELP, students learning gaps will be able to filled in a smaller group setting without then having to lose time during the core. 4. Ensure staff pulls real-time data specific to black students in order to have effective data chats and targeted support for improved learning. By looking closely at the academic data of black students, teachers will be able to adjust their instruction accordingly. They can meet with these students specifically to go over data and set goals. They will better be able to monitor student progress throughout the year and push these students to higher levels. Academic conversations will occur at all PLC's. 5. Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and

leaders on culturally relevant strategies to increase engagement and improve pass rates and grade point averages for black students. Teachers will be able to implement CRT with ease in their daily lessons across all subjects, but especially in ELA. Their awareness of the needs of Black students will increase, and they will be better equipped to build stronger, positive relationships with black students and families. This will lead to increase scores on FSA.

Person Responsible   William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	Conditions for Learning
Rationale	All measured subgroups do not perform at the same levels of proficiency. Specific focus on black students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged Students.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	All measured subgroups will perform at grade level proficiency within 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kathryn Gualtieri Gualtieri (gualtierik@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Every teacher and school-based staff engages in strategies and supports that the academic, social-emotional and behavioral needs of each and every student are known and met.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Performance of every subgroup is not systematically analyzed or problem-solved through an equitable lens.
Action Step	
Description	1. All teachers will be responsible for communicating a plan of action for the subgroups represented in their classroom. 2. Create learning environment where students feel they belong and are welcomed. 3. Continuously reflect on and improve personal teaching practices utilized in meeting the needs of each and every student. 4. Actively display, (re)teach and implement schoolwide Tier 1 practices and strategies. 5. Ground data conversations while looking at disaggregated data for all ESSA categories. 6. Gifted staff will introduce "Mindfulness" practices with all staff and ongoing support of PBIS. 7. Fully implement restorative practices in all areas of the school. 8. Model ways to handle disruptive behaviors in the classroom. 9. Conduct learning opportunities for staff members. 10. Monitor and support all staff for implementation with fidelity and provide specific feedback. 11. Address students with repeated behavior concerns in MTSS bi-weekly meetings to provide timely and effective strategies to implement in the classroom.
Person Responsible	Kathryn Gualtieri Gualtieri (gualtierik@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	Our current level of performance is eligible for silver status in 3 out of the 6 modules, as evidenced in the Alliance for a healthier Generation-Healthy Schools Program Assessment. 1. We expect our performance level to be working towards being eligible for silver status in 4 out of 6 of the modules by improving in an item on the assessment by May 2020. 2. The problem/gap is occurring because as a healthy school team we are prioritizing the healthy school items that we want to improve in. 3. If our Healthy School Team working on an action step on the Healthy School Assessment would occur, the problem would be reduced by we will make progress in becoming eligible for silver status in 4 out of 6 modules on the Healthy School Assessment.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	As a school, we will increase from being eligible for silver status in 5 out of 6 modules to working towards being eligible for silver status in 5 out of 6 modules, as measured by The Alliance for a Healthier Generation-Healthy Schools Program Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kathryn Gualtieri Gualtieri (gualtierik@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. We will meet as a Healthy School Team to develop an action plan to improve in one of the items on the Healthy School Assessment so that we can work on achieving silver status in another module on the Healthy School Assessment. We will meet to monitor our progress on this goal. 2. Healthy School Team Leader will attend trainings as they are offered by the district. 3. Monthly meetings to learn practices that promote schoolwide health and wellness
Person Responsible	Kathryn Gualtieri Gualtieri (gualtierik@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Our current attendance rate is 95.2%. 7% of student the population was absent 10% or more of the school year.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We expect our attendance rate will increase to 98% by May 2020. We anticipate our high absentee percentage to decrease from 7% to 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all tiers on an on-going basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because correlation between attendance and achievement is not understood. If targeted information was communicated directly to individual parents in their home language on the attendance/achievement correlation, the problem would be reduced by 2.8 %.

Action Step

Description	1. Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes (e.g. Pending entries cleared). 2. Review data and effectiveness of school-wide attendance strategies on a biweekly basis. 3. Engage students and families in attendance related activities to ensure they are knowledgeable of the attendance data and aware of the correlation between attendance and achievement 4. When possible, communication sent to parents for attendance purpose will be translated into home language. 5. We will also work to strengthen the implementation of tier two and three interventions to address and support the needs of the students and parents. 5. Develop and implement attendance incentive programs. 6. Intentional focus will be on analysis of attendance rates with classroom teachers and staff to develop action plans to decrease numbers of students absent more than 10%..
Person Responsible	William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Family and Community Engagement
Rationale	A need exists to ensure all groups that attend events at Davis are representative of our school population.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Numbers of parents that attend academic and community events will be representative of our school population as measured by event attendance records.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Purposefully involve families with opportunities for academic engagement through intentional and positive relationships with family and community partners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	It is imperative for us to build strong school to home relationships with families through an equitable lens in an effort to enfranchise all families.

Action Step	
Description	1. Staff will Increase positive interaction with parents/families on a regular basis that address student academic needs through after-school and evening events. 2. Staff will increase academic communication efforts based on equitable needs. 3. Streamline family engagement efforts that are result-oriented (linked to learning), by confirming families. practice new tips or tools; learn new tips to support their child a home; share knowledge about their child with teacher. 4. Conduct regular data chats with parents/students to discuss student progress (FSA scale score), MAP, Grade-level standards). 5. Utilize focus groups to gather parents and family input for development of school improvement. 6. Translate communication to parents in native language for academic and community events. 7. Provide academic tools to families in support of student achievement at home. (Content committees will coordinate curriculum events designed to help engage parents in our academic programs and technologies).
Person Responsible	William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	EL students
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 41% of our EL students are making Learning Gains in ELA as evidenced by the 2019 FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because of need for collaboration with classroom teachers and changes in servicing. If collaborative planning and a "push-in" service model would occur with EL assistants, students will be more likely to have supports necessary to grapple with grade level vocabulary and texts.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Percentage of EL students making Learning Gains in English Language Arts will increase from 41% to 75% as measured by 2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kathryn Gualtieri Gualtieri (gualtierik@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Strengthen school processes for engaging ELL students and families through meaningful communication. 2. Support instructional staff on utilizing data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. 3. Plan and provide instruction that is based on students levels of English proficiency, is aligned to grade level standards, and includes language objectives.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	A need exists to enfranchise our limited English speaking families with the educational setting. With equitable efforts from school staff to communicate more effectively this barrier to success will be eliminated. Our EL students also need more time with grade level material with support and assistance from EL staff members during core content instruction.

Action Step	
Description	1. Review school-based data in a dis-aggregate manner and thoughtfully plan for remediation and enrichment interventions. 2. Provide learning opportunities for teachers and staff to plan and implement effective instruction that engages English learners to advance learning and language development across all content areas. 3. EL assistants will work with general education teachers to create a schedule that promotes a "push-in" model of learning support. 4. All means of communication with parents will be translated into native language when possible. 5. Utilize learning opportunities for teachers and staff on the use of the WIDA Ellevation reports and Can Do Approach for all teachers to support classroom differentiated planning and instruction, based on student language proficiency levels. 6. Utilize Ellevation to obtain length of time and language proficiency levels in US schools for students coded LY; use this data to inform scheduling according to the ESOL department recommendations and provide this data to all teachers who will be working with them, so they can plan for effective instruction.

7. Utilize and monitor the implementation of "Can Do" Name charts and the Model Performance Indicators in the planning practice within all classrooms to ensure the instruction matches the needs of ELs and scaffolding provides an appropriate entry-point for grade -level content with ongoing student feedback.

8. Have a school plan for meaningful communication with families via the website, newsletter, parent letters, phone calls, etc. and ensure communication is available in languages spoken by ELs; utilize LionBridge Interpretation phone services.

Person Responsible Kathryn Gualtieri Gualtieri (gualtierik@pcsb.org)

#10	
Title	Gifted
Rationale	Gifted students scoring a level 4 & 5 on the ELA and Mathematics portions of the FSA are 9% and 5% below the state average respectively.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Gifted students at Davis will meet the state average of students scoring a level 4 or 5 in ELA and Mathematics. In addition, we expect that 90% of our gifted students will make Learning Gains in ELA and Mathematics by May 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	As a school our gifted students increased the percent of students making learning gains from 52% to over 84% in ELA. With that said, in all content areas the students at Davis exceed district and state levels of performance. Our gifted students scoring a level 4 or 5 are below the averages at the district and state level.

Action Step

Description	1. Continue to cluster group gifted and talented students so that the process of engaging gifted students in complex tasks is more accessible. 2. Help gifted learners understand "supported risk" and utilize to help gifted learners more effectively engage in complex tasks. 3. Provide opportunities for gifted learners that incorporate "fuzzier problems". 4. Incorporate opportunities for gifted learners to "transfer" knowledge. 5. Offer gifted learners opportunities for real world problem solving that incorporate critical and creative thinking. 6. Teachers/Staff obtain the gifted micro-credential and/or the gifted endorsement so they can better engage gifted learners in complex tasks. 7. Teachers attend professional development on "embedding creativity in the content areas". 8. Teachers attend professional development on "differentiation for gifted learners" . 9. Administrators recommend that Deliberate Practice Plans incorporate opportunities for growth in the area of engaging gifted students in complex tasks.
Person Responsible	Kathryn Gualtieri Gualtieri (gualtierik@pcsb.org)

#11	
Title	ESE
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 62% of students making gains in ELA, as evidenced in 2019 FSA data. We expect our performance level to be 75% by Spring 2020. The problem/gap is occurring because of a lack in collaborative teacher planning and instruction. If high leveraged strategies that support Standards-Based Planning and Instruction would occur, the problem would be reduced by 31%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	1. The percent of ESE students making Learning Gains in ELA will increase from 62% to 75% and in Mathematics from 70% to 75%, as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students requiring ESE services work towards mastery of meaningful Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our ESE students continue to struggle with mastery of grade level content as evidence by the percentages of Level 1 & 2 on the FSA. Our continued efforts to collaboratively plan grade level material with general education teachers and servicing our ESE students via a "push-in" model and will provide timely support for increases in proficient performance.
Action Step	
Description	1. Implement a process for placing students requiring ESE services in master schedules first in order to optimize service delivery and focused on a clustering process to meet student needs. 2. Provide opportunities for ESE and general education teachers to co-plan for differentiated instruction and support delivery of services. 3. Embed metacognitive strategies into content-based instruction to teach students critical memory and engagement processes they can use to access, retain, and generalize important content. 4 Make rigorous texts, materials, content and activities accessible to students through supplementary aids including annotated texts and assistive technology. 5. Collect and interpret data from DreamBox, iStation, OPM and MAP to monitor progress with IEP goals and objectives and drive instruction based on student need including regular and purposeful adjustment to accommodations and interventions. 6. VE Resource staff will work with general education teachers to create a schedule that promotes a "push-in" model of learning support.
Person Responsible	William Durst (durstw@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 Instruction and Intervention**				**$750.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0991 - Leila Davis Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$750.00
			Notes: Purchase of iReady Classroom materials for Intervention Block. Focus on students in our lowest 35% on FSA ELA.			
2	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Math Instruction and Intervention**				**$500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3376	120-Classroom Teachers	0991 - Leila Davis Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$500.00
			Notes: Instructional rounds in Mathematics instruction			
3	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Science Instruction**				**$0.00**
4	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap - Black Student Achievement**				**$0.00**
5	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Conditions for Learning**				**$1,750.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3376	120-Classroom Teachers	0991 - Leila Davis Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$1,000.00
	1530	330-Travel	0991 - Leila Davis Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$750.00
6	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools**				**$0.00**
7	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Attendance**				**$0.00**
8	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement**				**$0.00**
9	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: EL students**				**$0.00**
10	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Gifted**				**$750.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3376	120-Classroom Teachers	0991 - Leila Davis Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$750.00
			Notes: Confratute at the University of Connecticut.			

11	III.A	Areas of Focus: ESE	$0.00
		Total:	$3,750.00