Pinellas County Schools

Mcmullen Booth Elementary School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mcmullen Booth Elementary School

3025 UNION ST, Clearwater, FL 33759

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

Demographics

Principal: Susan Manche

Start Date for this Principal: 11/15/2015

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
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: B
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: C 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	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of McMullen-Booth Elementary School is to work together to meet the needs of each and every student through rigorous and relational opportunities that will ensure their highest academic achievement and support our students as leaders of tomorrow.

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
Manche, Susan	Principal
Principal	
Poole, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Bilello, Kathy	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Zadeh, Alicia	Teacher, ESE
Teacher, ESE	
Frazier, Erin	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
McClistere, Nicole	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Peters, Stacey	Other
Other	
Johnson- Drummond, Angela	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Melendez, Cynthia	Other
Other	
Fish, Stacey	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
O'Malley, Diane	Attendance/Social Work
Attendance/Social Work	
Bishop, Vickie	Psychologist
Psychologist	

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	91	91	99	101	106	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	616
Attendance below 90 percent	15	10	9	12	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	3	0	2	4	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	5	2	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	21	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	2	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

37

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	47%	54%	57%	39%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	59%	58%	36%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	54%	53%	43%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	57%	61%	63%	58%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	62%	61%	62%	51%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	48%	51%	30%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	54%	53%	53%	47%	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	91 (0)	91 (0)	99 (0)	101 (0)	106 (0)	128 (0)	616 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	15 ()	10 ()	9 ()	12 ()	10 ()	11 ()	67 (0)
One or more suspensions	3 ()	0 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	10 (0)	21 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	6 (0)	5 (0)	2 (0)	14 (0)	2 (0)	29 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	21 (0)	33 (0)	54 (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	49%	56%	-7%	58%	-9%
	2018	52%	53%	-1%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	56%	-18%	58%	-20%
	2018	36%	51%	-15%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
	2018	28%	50%	-22%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	48%	62%	-14%	62%	-14%
	2018	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	64%	0%	64%	0%
	2018	63%	62%	1%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	57%	60%	-3%	60%	-3%
	2018	47%	61%	-14%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	53%	54%	-1%	53%	0%
	2018	45%	57%	-12%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	28	47	46	34	47	42	43				
ELL	43	53	50	60	67	44	50				
BLK	31	48	42	30	50	45	31				
HSP	43	55	48	57	62	45	43				
MUL	56	67		50	80						
WHT	55	62	62	65	64	47	71				
FRL	46	61	58	53	61	49	51				

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	22	35	38	44	41	22	31				
ELL	24	51	58	51	50	45	35				
BLK	18	9	20	33	22	9	33				
HSP	27	44	50	50	52	44	44				
MUL	42	20		47	50						
WHT	52	34	40	70	58	29	52				
FRL	35	36	40	54	45	27	39				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	54
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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	62
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

2018 Data
Breakdown by grade levels:
ELA overall
3rd- 49% proficiency (-3% from last year)
4th- 38% proficiency (+2% from last year)
Our 4th grade ELL students performed in ELA at 0% proficiency due to the need for core tasks to be at an increased level of rigor, matching the end of the year expectations and increased instruction in academic vocabulary.

Math overall
3rd- 48% proficiency (-11% from last year)
Overall gains of 4th and 5th grade lowest 25%- 46% (+16% from last year)
Our 3rd grade 48% math proficiency was due to the need for core tasks to be at an increased level of rigor, matching the end of the year expectations and increased instruction in academic vocabulary. Increased focus on ELA may have negatively impacted scheduled Math instructional time including time spent on ST Math.

Breakdown by ESSA:
Black students (BLK) ELA proficiency was 18% proficiency.
Students with disabilities (SWD) ELA proficiency was 22% proficiency.
English Language Learner students (ELL) ELA proficiency was 24% proficiency.
Black students (BLK) Math proficiency was 33% proficiency.
ESSA subgroups proficiency correlates with the need for specific and intentional scaffolds to support an increased level of rigor for end of the year expectations.

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

All but one component showed gains over last year.

3rd grade Math proficiency- 48% (-11% from last year.)
Math instruction was not done with fidelity at the level of rigor aligned to end of year expectations with fidelity , including academic vocabulary. Increased focus on ELA may have negatively impacted scheduled Math instructional time including time spent on ST Math.

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

4th grade ELA at 38% proficient was 20% below the state average.
Our 4th grade ELL students performed in ELA at 0% proficiency due to the need for core tasks to be at an increased level of rigor, matching the end of the year expectations and increased instruction in academic vocabulary.

3rd grade Math at 48% proficient was 14% below the state average.
Our 3rd grade 48% math proficiency was due to the need for core tasks to be at an increased level of rigor, matching the end of the year expectations and increased instruction in academic vocabulary. Increased focus on ELA may have negatively impacted scheduled Math instructional time including time spent on ST Math.

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

ELA and Science increased in all components. Math increased in every component except for Math proficiency (decreased by 1%.)
Data component showing most improvement was ELA learning gains (by 22%.)
Actions:
- All students received ELA small group instruction during structured Intervention Block with additional support of ESE and ELL resource teachers, two ELL associates, three hourly teachers (funded by Title 1,) three paras and one teacher associate, varying from daily to once a week. Administration supported fidelity through walkthroughs and feedback and District coaches supported teachers with fidelity of implementation of instruction.
- District coach worked monthly with intermediate ELA teachers on writing and ELA core instruction, including skill groups for core remediation.
- Additional training on Thinking Maps supporting integration of texts and writing instruction.
- Coaching support from UCF coach on coteaching and ESOL strategies. In addition provided PD on MPI's and academic vocabulary.
-Weekly collaborative planning and additional weekly 45 minutes.
-Title 1 funds used to purchase RR kits, Literacy Footprint Kits and word cards for teachers. PD provided for RR and small group fidelity.
-As part of Closing the Gender Gap , grant money used to purchase books for Independent Reading initiative consisting of rolling carts of Independent Reading books selected on boys' interest and Science books for independent reading Science Club.
- District funds used to buy bilingual books supporting home reading for ELL students.
- ELP focused on 3rd- 5th graders for ELA needs..
- Focused on ensuring completion of I-Station.

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

67 students missing 10% or more of the school year.
54 students scored at Level 1 on the FSA.

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

1. ELA proficiency overall (including ELL and ESE students)
2. Closing the Achievement Gap with Black students' ELA Proficiency/ESSA

3. Math for Lowest 25%
4. Reduction of Black suspensions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Goal
Rationale	1.Our current level of performance is 47%, as evidenced in 3rd-5th FSA results. 2.We expect our performance level to be 63% by May 2020. 3.The problem/gap is occurring because of the lack of rigorous student engagement during core and their inability to apply knowledge to the level of the complexity of assessment tasks. 4.If rigorous student engagement was increased during core and they were able to apply their knowledge to complete complex tasks would occur, the problem would be reduced by 16%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students making ELA gains will increase from 47% to 63% and the percent of lowest 25% of all students making ELA gains will increase from 52% to 60%, as measured by FSA .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kathy Bilello (bilellok@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs. English Language supports, as well as extensions/ more advanced texts for students above benchmarks. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To provide strong core instruction enabling all students to make at least a year's worth of growth, as they strive to reach proficiency measured by MAP projected FSA proficiency and FSA results.
Action Step	
Description	1. Enhance the rigor of the ELA curriculum and instruction by strengthening the alignment to the depth of the Florida Language Arts standards. (All student tasks and assessments match the cognitive complexity of the standard.) 2. Collaboratively plan for student-centered complex tasks based on individual student needs utilizing strategies and module resources including: higher level questioning, explicit vocabulary instruction, Thinking Maps, and I-station. District ELA Module Planning Hubs will support this collaborative planning. 3. Teachers will intentionally plan for instruction to include the use of challenging text within the complexity band, allowing students to engage in productive struggle through discussion questions and inquiry (student-centered learning). 4. Daily ELA block will include: Tier I core instruction (daily reading and writing explicit teaching points) using grade-level text with instructional supports for all learners; Tier 2 instruction, with fidelity, to include guided reading (Jan Richardson/Repeated Reading Routine/LLI/Book Clubs or other

researched-based small group strategies). Tier 3 instruction to include collaboration between classroom teacher and resource teacher or interventionist in planning process.
5. Utilize L300 intervention schedule to support all learners.
6. Daily independent reading will occur for rigorous independent practice of reading skills and strategies to build stamina, increase background knowledge and academic vocabulary development.
7. Explicit writing instruction to include responding to text(s) and tasks that align to essay writing rubric specifications which will be evident by progression of student artifacts in ongoing writing portfolios and notebooks. (Module D or last writing assessment to be placed in PIAP folder)
8. Provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction utilizing Thinking Maps, Pinellas Vocabulary Project, and higher order questions as measured by use of academic vocabulary when reading, writing, and speaking.
9. Monitor students' levels of understanding and provide feedback to support student autonomy and proficiency which will allow students opportunity to revise responses and deepen their understanding when completing tasks.
10. Utilize district unit assessments, I-Station reports, MAP continuum, classroom assessment data, formative assessments, and student artifacts to drive instruction; this includes creating an on-going plan to address deficits and enrichment needs.
11. Provide and utilize ongoing professional development through ELA leadership team, ELA cohort teacher, curriculum specialist Just-in-Time coaching, teacher modeling and peer coaching associated with but not limited to the above action steps.
12. Routine articulation meeting among grade-level teams to include the review of scope and sequence continuum of standards, FSA test specs, student artifacts, and cohesive use of Thinking Maps.
13. Monitoring of instruction, etc. along with feedback, will be done by administration through routine walkthroughs to support fidelity of all action steps.

Person Responsible	Jacqueline Poole (poolejac@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Mathematics Goal
Rationale	1.Our current level of performance is 57%, as evidenced in 3rd-5th FSA results. 2.We expect our performance level to be 70% by May 2020. 3.The problem/gap is occurring because of the need for planning and implementation of more rigorous core instruction and intentional foundational support for students based on current data. 4.If planning and implementation of more rigorous core instruction and foundational support would occur, the problem would be reduced by 13%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving math proficiency will increase from 57% to 70%, as measured by FSA. The lowest twenty-five percent will increase from 46% to 68%, as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Nicole McClistere (mcclistern@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 the work through curriculum meetings, PLC's, feedback and/or the use of classroom video.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To provide strong core instruction enabling all students to make at least a year's worth of growth, as they strive to reach proficiency measured by MAP projected FSA proficiency and FSA results.
Action Step	
Description	1. Ensure that instruction is aligned to, and at the level of rigor of, all grade level standards. All tasks match the cognitive complexity of the standard and all assessments. 2. Collaboratively plan for student-centered complex tasks based on individual student needs utilizing strategies and resources including: higher level questioning, explicit vocabulary instruction, Number Talks, High-Yield Number Routines, Thinking Maps, Dreambox Learning, Ready Math, and STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Math) integration. Planning can be done through district Collaborative Planning Hubs and coaching support during PLC's. 3. Instructional model includes concise explicit instruction of targeted teaching point with follow-up opportunities for students to practice individually and collaboratively within the context of the required district daily math block. 4. Provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction utilizing Thinking Maps, written reflections, Pinellas Vocabulary Project, and higher order questions. 5. Monitor students' levels of understanding and provide feedback to support student autonomy and proficiency which will allow students opportunity to revise responses and deepen their understanding when completing tasks such as reflections in math notebook.

	6. Utilize district unit assessments, Dreambox Learning reports, MAP continuum, classroom assessment data, formative assessments, and student artifacts to drive instruction; this includes creating an on-going plan to address deficits and enrichment needs. 7. Provide and utilize ongoing professional development through Math Leadership team (MTLI cohort), curriculum specialist Just-in-Time coaching, teacher modeling and peer coaching associated with but not limited to the above action steps 8. Routine articulation meeting among grade-level teams to review scope and sequence continuum of standards, FSA test specs, and error analysis. 9. Monitoring of instruction, etc. along with feedback, will be done by administration through routine walkthroughs to support fidelity of all action steps.
Person Responsible	Susan Manche (manches@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science Goal
Rationale	1.Our current level of performance is 54% proficiency, as evidenced by the 5th grade State Science Assessment. 2.We expect our performance level to be 70% by May 2020. 3.The problem/gap is occurring because of a lack of retention of previously taught content and a lack of fidelity of grade level core instruction. 4.If student-centered science instruction with rigor within all grade levels would occur, the problem would be reduced by at least 16%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of 5th grade students performing proficiently in science will increase from 54% to 70%, as measured by the State Science Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Erin Frazier (frazierer@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	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, and 20% confirming the learning) and include appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignment to 1st–5th grade standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To provide strong core instruction enabling all students to make at least a year's worth of growth, as they strive to reach proficiency measured by SSA results.
Action Step	
Description	1. Use the instructional model of 10%-70%-20% instructional daily routine and the 5Es for student-centered, rigorous learning 2. Students will be provided the opportunity to learn through hands-on inquiry experiences in the science lab as scheduled. 3. Collaboratively plan for and utilize inquiry, higher level questioning and explicit academic vocabulary instruction that aligns to science standards. Include: Thinking Maps, STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Math) integration, and enlarged vocabulary cards. 4. Monitor students using district unit assessments and provide feedback to support student autonomy and proficiency which will allow students the opportunity to revise responses and deepen their understanding. 5. Provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction utilizing Thinking Maps, Pinellas Vocabulary Project, 60 Power words, and higher order questions as measured by use of academic vocabulary when reading, writing, and speaking. 6. Monitor students' levels of understanding and provide feedback to support student autonomy and proficiency which will allow students opportunity to revise responses and deepen their understanding when completing tasks. 7. Utilize district unit and lab assessments, classroom assessment data, formative assessments, and student artifacts to drive instruction; this

	includes creating an on-going 3rd- 5th grade Diagnostic plan to address standards deficits and enrichment needs. 8. Provide and utilize ongoing professional development through curriculum specialist Just-in-Time coaching, teacher modeling and peer coaching, associated with but not limited to the above action steps 9. Routine articulation meetings among grade-level teams to include the review of scope and sequence continuum of standards, 5th grade Diagnostic, SSA test specs, student artifacts, and cohesive use of Thinking Maps. 10. Monitoring of instruction, etc. along with feedback, will be done by administration through routine walkthroughs to support fidelity of all action steps.
Person Responsible	Susan Manche (manches@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Bridging the Gap Plan/ ESSA - Black Student Achievement Goal
Rationale	1.Our current level of performance is 32.4%, as evidenced in 2019 FSA ELA results. 2.We expect our performance level to be 63% by May 2020. 3.The problem/gap is occurring because of a lack of student engagement supported by specific and intentional scaffolds and a need for an increased use of culturally relevant instructional practices. 4.If highly engaging, culturally relevant instruction supported by scaffolding would occur, the problem would be reduced by 30.6%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of black students performing proficiently in ELA will increase from 32.4% to 63%, as measured by the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cathy Kelly (kellycat@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure instructional supports are in place during core instruction and independence, including Culturally Responsive practices. English Language supports, as well as extensions/ more advanced texts for students above benchmarks. These supports include access to grade- level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To provide strong core instruction enabling all students to make at least a year's worth of growth, as they strive to reach proficiency measured by MAP projected FSA proficiency and FSA results.
Action Step	
Description	1. Planning for and implementing the use of Culturally Responsive practices 2. Continue to implement restorative practices and establishing restorative classroom cultures throughout the school. 3. Encourage black students to enroll/participate in extended learning opportunities for remediation and enrichment (STEM, Manatee Club, Math Club, Promise Time, Boys Battle of the Books, etc) 4. Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on culturally relevant strategies to increase engagement and improve achievement performance associated with but not limited to the above action steps
Person Responsible	Jacqueline Poole (poolejac@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	School Climate/ Conditions for Learning Goal
Rationale	1. Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 79 referrals. We expect our performance level to be 70 referrals by May 2020. 2. The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because a lack of school-wide fidelity for restorative practices and providing student services. 3. If fidelity increased for provision of restorative practices and student services would occur, the problem would be reduced by 5%, as evidenced by monthly referral data on the school profile to exceed no higher than 8 referrals per month. (include data to validate your hypothesis.) 4. We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation of our strategies by May 2020. 5. Review student and teacher data on monthly basis for trends and next steps. 6. Update school-wide plan on a monthly basis.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students receiving referrals will decrease from 8.4% to 5%, as measured by referral data on school profile.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stacey Peters (petersst@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Support the development and/or implementation of school-wide ownership of equitable practices that engage students in acknowledging and adhering to processes and procedures. 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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy is to decrease percentage of students receiving referrals to ultimately increase overall academic proficiency.
Action Step	
Description	1. Routine professional development for Restorative Practice (RP), Social/ Emotional Learning (SEL), and Equity. 2. Implementation of routine restorative circles to establish a restorative classroom culture 3. Roll out of the MBES House System to support PBIS 4. Continue the use of best practices for engaging boys as well as providing professional development for support. 5. Monitor and support staff for implementation with fidelity of RP/SEL/Equity

Person Responsible	Stacey Fish (fishst@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Attendance Goal
Rationale	1. Our current attendance rate is 90%. We expect our performance level to be 95% by May 2020. 2. The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because of a lack of parental understanding and resources. 3. If parent understanding and resources would occur, the problem would be reduced by 5%. 4. We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation of our strategies by bi-monthly monitoring.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students missing 10% or more of school will decrease from 12% to 9%, as measured by attendance data dashboard.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Diane O'Malley (omalleyd@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the implementation of Tier I interventions to address and support the needs of students. Strengthen the implementation of Tier 2 interventions to address and support the needs of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy is to increase percentage of attendance to ultimately increase overall academic proficiency.
Action Step	
Description	1. Review attendance taking process and school-wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff. 2. Utilize MBES House Systems for interventions and incentives to support increased attendance for each Tier. 3. Engage students and families to ensure they are knowledgeable of the data and aware of the importance of attendance. 4. Review data and effectiveness of school-wide attendance strategies on a bi-monthly basis. 5. Implement Tier 2 and 3 plans for student specific needs and review barriers and effectiveness on a bi-monthly basis. 6. Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes (e.g. Pending entries cleared).
Person Responsible	Stacey Fish (fishst@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Family and Community Engagement Goal
Rationale	The rationale for this goal is to strengthen relationships with our families and increase their level of understanding to best support their participation within our school community.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase percentage of parents' understanding of their child's learning needs as measured by the Title I Survey from 75% to 90% under the question 'Do you know how to make sure this school meets your child's learning needs?'
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Effectively communicate with families about their students’ progress and school processes/practices. Provide academic tools through monthly events, such as parent breakfasts, in support of their student's achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for choosing this strategy is to support student achievement and increase parent engagement.
Action Step	
Description	1. Utilize all school communication tools to disseminate information to families (English and Spanish). 2. Educate families through parent breakfasts, grade level information nights, Teacher/Parent Student Led Conferences, Title I Information Center, Family Math Nights, ELA Literacy, STEM night, Curriculum Showcase and PTA sponsored events. . 3. Collaborate with PTA in support of school-wide events
Person Responsible	Tanya Hilkert (hilkertt@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Healthy Schools Goal
Rationale	1. Our current level of performance is approaching gold, as evidenced in the Alliance Generation, Healthy Schools Program Framework. 2. We expect our performance level to be silver or gold by April 2020. 3. The problem/gap is occurring because of not meeting specific criteria of rubric.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our school will be eligible for silver or gold recognition by April 2020 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Framework
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for this strategy is to increase the wellness of staff and students allowing us to earn silver or gold status.
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. 2. Attend district-supported professional development 3. Develop and Implement Healthy School Program Action Plan 4. Update Healthy Schools Program Assessment and Apply for Recognition (if applicable)
Person Responsible	Bonnie Bender (benderb@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	Gender Gap
Rationale	Currently, 43% of our boys are proficient in ELA as compared to 46% of our girls in grades 3-5.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of male students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 43% to 63%, as measured by FSA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the equitable engagement opportunities for boys. Provide a physical learning environment that is conducive for learning. Enhance the relationship-building skills for boys.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To provide strong core instruction enabling all students to make at least a year's worth of growth, as they strive to reach proficiency measured by MAP projected FSA proficiency and FSA results.
Action Step	
Description	1. Enhance the establishment of a restorative classroom culture 2. Enhance the use of "Closing the Gender-Gap" strategies 3. Focus on the use of strategies introduced by our Equity Champions and associated professional development 4. Ensure the cohesive use of Thinking Maps across content areas to make the learning more student centered and differentiated for each individual learner. 5. Continue the use of "Adventure Island" mobile library 6. Continue flexible seating options and increase opportunities for movement 7. Roll out of the MBES House System to decrease the Gender Gap. 8. Participate in professional development and coaching opportunities associated with but not limited to the above action steps.
Person Responsible	Stacey Peters (petersst@pcsb.org)

#10	
Title	ESE
Rationale	1. Our current level of performance is 46%, as evidenced in 3rd-5th FSA results. 2. We expect our performance level to be 63% by May 2020. 3. The problem/gap is occurring because of the lack of rigorous student engagement and their inability to apply knowledge to the level of the complexity of assessment tasks. 4. If rigorous student engagement was increased and they were able to apply their knowledge to complete complex tasks would occur, the problem would be reduced by 17%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students making ELA gains will increase from 46% to 73% and the percent of lowest 25% of all students making ELA gains will increase from 50% to 60%, as measured by FSA .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Susan Manche (manches@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs. English Language supports, as well as extensions/ more advanced texts for students above benchmarks. These supports include access to grade- level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To provide strong core instruction enabling all students to make at least a year's worth of growth, as they strive to reach proficiency measured by MAP projected FSA proficiency and FSA results.
Action Step	
Description	1.ESE and classroom teachers routinely collaboratively plan for grade level student-centered complex tasks deliberately designed with a trajectory of rigor and challenge utilizing appropriate ESE strategies including: higher level questioning and explicit vocabulary instruction. 2.Monitor the use of appropriate curriculum and supportive strategies to ensure student needs are met. 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.Ensure the cohesive use of Thinking Maps across content areas to make the learning more student centered and differentiated for each individual learner. 5. Participate in professional development associated with but not limited to the above action steps
Person Responsible	Alicia Zadeh (zadeha@pcsb.org)

#11	
Title	ELL
Rationale	1. Our current level of performance is 30%, as evidenced in 3rd-5th FSA results. 2. We expect our performance level to be 63% by May 2020. 3. The problem/gap is occurring because of the lack of rigorous student engagement during core, limited academic vocabulary knowledge and their inability to apply knowledge to the level of the complexity of assessment tasks. 4. If rigorous student engagement was increased and they were able to apply their knowledge to complete complex tasks would occur, the problem would be reduced by 33%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students making ELA gains will increase from 30% to 63% as measured by FSA .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cynthia Melendez (melendezc@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for EL students including academic language instruction. English Language supports, as well as extensions/ more advanced texts for students above benchmarks. These supports include access to grade- level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To provide strong core instruction enabling all students to make at least a year's worth of growth, as they strive to reach proficiency measured by MAP projected FSA proficiency and FSA results.
Action Step	
Description	1. ESOL and classroom teachers routinely collaboratively plan for grade level student-centered complex tasks deliberately designed with a trajectory of rigor and challenge utilizing appropriate ESOL strategies including: higher level questioning and explicit academic vocabulary instruction. 2. Monitor the use of appropriate curriculum and supportive strategies to ensure student needs are met. 3. Utilize Can Do descriptors and Model Performance Indicators (MPI) when planning lessons and associated student tasks. Elevation can be utilized to determine students' language proficiency levels and the data can be sued to create appropriate instruction based on EL levels of English proficiency. 4. 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. 5.Ensure the cohesive use of Thinking Maps across content areas to make the learning more student centered and differentiated for each individual learner. 6. Support family engagement through frequent communication including:

weekly School messenger,
6. Participate in professional development and coaching opportunities (with Cindy Walters) associated with but not limited to the above action steps

Person Responsible Jacqueline Poole (poolejac@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 Goal**				**$1,500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	2301 - Mcmullen Booth Elementary Schl	School Improvement Funds		$750.00
			Notes: 50% of $3000 SIP funds will be used for curriculum. 50% of that ($750) will be used for ELA curriculum items, such as Thinking Map resources or student books.			
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	2301 - Mcmullen Booth Elementary Schl	School Improvement Funds		$750.00
			Notes: 50% of $3000 SIP funds will be used for Professional Development (PD,) including collaborative planning. 50% of that ($750) will be used for ELA PD.			
2	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Mathematics Goal**				**$1,500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	2301 - Mcmullen Booth Elementary Schl			$750.00
			Notes: 50% of $3000 SIP funds will be used for curriculum. 50% of that ($750) will be used for Math curriculum items, such as Thinking Map resources or Math resources for new text book and to support Math Cohort training.			
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	2301 - Mcmullen Booth Elementary Schl			$750.00
			Notes: 50% of $3000 SIP funds will be used for Professional Development and collaborative planning. 50% of that ($750) will be used for Math PD and planning, such as the new Ready Math curriculum resources.			
3	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Science Goal**				**$0.00**
4	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap Plan/ ESSA - Black Student Achievement Goal**				**$0.00**
5	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: School Climate/ Conditions for Learning Goal**				**$0.00**
6	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Attendance Goal**				**$0.00**

7	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement Goal**	**$0.00**
8	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools Goal**	**$0.00**
9	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Gender Gap**	**$0.00**
10	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: ESE**	**$0.00**
11	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: ELL**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$3,000.00**