

Pinellas County Schools

# Mount Vernon Elementary School



## 2019-20 School Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Mount Vernon Elementary School

4629 13TH AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33713

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Robert Ovalle A**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2016

<b>2018-19 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grade</b>	2018-19: C
<b>School Grades History</b>	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: C 2013-14: C
<b>2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Tracy Webley</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N
<b>Year</b>	A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement

100% Student Success!

#### Provide the school's vision statement

Where every student will make a learning gain!

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title
Ovalle, Robert	Principal
Principal	
Wike, Victoria	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Doege Bayliss, Johanna	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Lawless, Page	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Peers, Jennifer	Other
Other	

### 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	24	51	65	51	57	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309
Attendance below 90 percent	2	9	10	12	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	4	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

**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	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

31

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

Monday 7/15/2019

**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	56	71	54	62	63	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	376
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	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	46%	54%	57%	40%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	59%	58%	51%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	54%	53%	43%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	52%	61%	63%	53%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	56%	61%	62%	55%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	48%	51%	48%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	45%	53%	53%	54%	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	24 (0)	51 (0)	65 (0)	51 (0)	57 (0)	61 (0)	309 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 ( )	9 ( )	10 ( )	12 ( )	5 ( )	11 ( )	49 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	2 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	16 (0)	11 (0)	27 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	24 (0)	24 (0)	51 (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	37%	56%	-19%	58%	-21%
	2018	39%	53%	-14%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	56%	0%	58%	-2%
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
	2018	33%	50%	-17%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	62%	-17%	62%	-17%
	2018	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	64%	-4%	64%	-4%
	2018	60%	62%	-2%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	46%	60%	-14%	60%	-14%
	2018	41%	61%	-20%	61%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	15	30	24	20	33	28	18				
BLK	21	36	31	30	52	53	20				
HSP	57	50		54	56		45				
MUL	63	58		69	58						
WHT	61	50		64	52	30	71				
FRL	42	42	35	46	52	40	42				



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	11	30		19	41	47					
ELL	36			45							
BLK	23	39	35	37	46	44	38				
HSP	60	69		62	64						
MUL	50			57							
WHT	49	58		63	63		79				
FRL	34	44	32	48	51	48	53				

### 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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	318
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

### Subgroup Data

#### Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

#### English Language Learners

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

#### 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

<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
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
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
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**

ELA- LGL25 showed the lowest performance based on FSA. The contributing factors could be lack of standards based instruction, prior grade level achievement deficit, lack of a CRT classroom, and a lack of monitoring.

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

ELA- LGL25 showed the lowest performance based on FSA. The contributing factors could be lack of standards based instruction, prior grade level achievement deficit, lack of a CRT classroom, and a lack of monitoring.

#### **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**

Our L25 ELA had a the greatest gap compared to the state average. The factors that contributed to is the lack of standards based instruction in specific subgroups and the lack of specific grade level monitoring in the L25.

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

The area that had the most improvement was our ELA proficiency. A strong focus in the use of DBQ and specific targeted modules.

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

ELA achievement and course failure

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

1. LG L25 in ELA
2. LG L25 in Math
3. Science
4. LG Math
5. LG ELA

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	School wide behavior plan "MAGIC" (Motivation, Achievement, Growth Mindset, Integrity & Cooperation"
<b>Rationale</b>	Encourage good academic and social behavior, throughout the school.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	We will have school competitions, for the class/grade that collects the most tickets.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Page Lawless (lawlessj@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	PBIS
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To maximize academic and social behavioral outcomes of students
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All throughout school, in each common area, signs will depict each characteristic of MAGIC.</li> <li>2. When students are "caught" demonstrating one of these characteristics, they will receive a MAGIC ticket.</li> <li>3. Each class will compile the tickets and redeem, for a fun class activity or treat.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Page Lawless (lawlessj@pcsb.org)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Mathematics
<b>Rationale</b>	Our current level of math proficiency is 52% which is down from 53% as measured by the FSA. We expect our overall math goal to be 60% by the end of the school year. The problem /gap is occurring because of a strong alignment between task/target and a focus in standards based planning.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of all students achieving math proficiency will increase from to 60%, as measured by the FSA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Page Lawless (lawlessj@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Problem Based Learning
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Using standards based planning and problem based learning, students proficiency would increase in both, mathematics standards and learning goals.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will align standards with district content and problem based learning with a standards based calendar, and provide student checklists and interactive boards.</li> <li>2. Asses students on standards more frequently (MAP, Unit Assessment, Lesson Quizzes (weekly). Use the data to drive instruction through whole group lessons and small group interventions.</li> <li>3. Collaborate with team and coaches to create higher order thinking questions, to use during problem based learning.</li> <li>4. Participate in the Math Teacher Leader Institute (MTLI).</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Page Lawless (lawlessj@pcsb.org)

**#3****Title**

ELA

**Rationale**

Our current level of proficiency is 46% which is up from 40% from the previous year. All subject areas thrive via students ability to read and comprehend texts. Our teachers will work on standards based planning that focuses on student centered learning.

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

The percent of all students achieving reading proficiency will increase from 46% to 56%, as measured by the FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Johanna Doege Bayliss (doegej@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy**

1. Pinellas vocabulary project (K-5)
2. Document Based Questions (2-5)
3. Immerse students in the literacy block ensuring that reading and writing are key components with ample time to each area. This will include access to grade level texts and differentiated small group instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

Vocabulary is a crucial stepping stone in the reading progression. According the researcher Moats vocabulary increases both a students verbal IQ and comprehension. Thus, we will incorporate the Vocabulary Project into a school wide initiative. DBQs were essential in the increase in our 4th grade ELA scores. Their ability to push critical thinking and writing are research based and kid approved.

**Action Step****Description**

1. School wide initiative for Pinellas Vocabulary project
2. Awards given each week by grade level to earn tickets. Vocabulary bowl every quarter.
3. Reading coach to model DBQs starting in 2nd/3rd grade
4. Reading coach planning with teams to incorporate one DBQ per quarter with specific support for below benchmark readers.
5. Classrooms will mirror inquiry based student centered learning.
6. Administration will monitor the implementation of DBQ monthly at PLC's along with actionable feedback.

**Person Responsible**

Johanna Doege Bayliss (doegej@pcsb.org)

<b>#4</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Science
<b>Rationale</b>	Our Science proficiency % decreased by 9 points from 54% to 45% on the FSA. Our problem/gap is occurring because of lack of science knowledge and the lack of prior years science instruction.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of 5th grade students achieving proficiency will increase from 45% to 65%, as measured by FSA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Page Lawless (lawlessj@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	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-Monitor for consistent effective instruction that promotes student centered with rigor for all science labs grade 1-5.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Consistent implementation of the science lab is necessary for effective instruction along with the use of academic gaming.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implement and monitor the 60 Power Words instruction</li> <li>2. Utilize Science lab and lab assessments</li> <li>3. The use of the Science Super Bowl competition</li> <li>4. Use of scheduled PLC's to provide site based PD</li> <li>5. Monthly data chats based upon the Science unit data</li> <li>6. 5th grade monitoring using 3/4 unit assessments to reteach low performing units.</li> <li>7. Utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10/70/20 science instructional model (10% setting purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) and include appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignment to the 1-5 grade standards.</li> <li>8. Develop implement and monitor a data driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th grade Diagnostic Assessment</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Page Lawless (lawlessj@pcsb.org)

<b>#5</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bridging the Gap
<b>Rationale</b>	Our current level of performance is 35% in ELA, as measured by the Federal Percent of Point Index.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	We expect our performance level to increase from 35% to 50% as measured by the FPPI at the end of the school year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teachers will plan and implement culturally relevant instructional practices in the classroom.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	We have seen an increase in learning gains based on implementing CRT strategies and nurturing relationships with students and families.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Instructional staff will continue and strengthened the implementation of CRT strategies throughout all academic subjects with specific PD.</li> <li>2. Classroom teachers will collaboratively plan to incorporate the 6M model to increase engagement and motivation.</li> <li>3. Administrators will monitor teacher practice and provide targeted actionable feedback to support teacher growth.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)



<b>#6</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Attendance
<b>Rationale</b>	Students that are absent miss daily instruction that is needed to be successful.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	We will increase the percentage of overall attendance from 94% to 97% by the end of the year. Will decrease the percentage of students missing more than 10% of the school year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The CST will monitor attendance rates monthly and problem solve factors that are contributing to our attendance rates.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Attendance is crucial for student success.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Discuss the importance of Attendance at Open House and at each family night.</li> <li>2. A school wide initiatives (celebrations) based on positive attendance habits by classes and grade levels.</li> <li>3. Contact those families that have a pattern of excessive absences as soon as it occurs.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

<b>#7</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Family and Community Engagement
<b>Rationale</b>	According to the Annual Title 1 Parent survey we had % rate of parents attending the Title 1 Annual meeting Open House, % of parents responded they volunteered at school and % of families attended events.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of parents attending the Title 1 Annual Meeting and Open House will increase from % to 75% as measured on the Title 1 Annual Survey.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Page Lawless (lawlessj@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Implement school and family events in a systematic, integrated sustained and meaningful approach that will engage parents and families in learning that is interactive and collaborative.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	We believe that effective parent/family engagement is grounded in partnership of shared responsibility among families, community organizations and schools and that is occurs across multiple settings and contexts in which children can learn and families can connect.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Actively encourage family participation in scheduled events through relationships, advertising and social media.</li> <li>2. Provide multiple opportunities for families to get involved through a variety of activities at home and at school through communication: website, School Messenger, marquee, flyers and Facebook.</li> <li>3. Continue to promote and recruit mentors through our partnership with Raymond James and Lunch Pals.</li> <li>4. Create a welcoming and diverse environment for all families.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Page Lawless (lawlessj@pcsb.org)

<b>#8</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Healthy Schools
<b>Rationale</b>	Our current level of performance is Silver, as evidenced in Alliance for a Healthier Generation. We expect our performance level to be Gold status by the end of the 2020 school year. The problem/gap is occurring because not being eligible for gold status due to action items in module 5 and module 6. If adjustments within each module would occur, the problem would be reduced by achieving the required items to reach gold status.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	To achieve Gold Status on the Alliance for Healthier Generation's Schools Program Assessment.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	If we follow the guidelines for the Healthier Generation our school will earn our Gold status by completing the framework with fidelity.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	By following the framework on the Healthier Generation Alliance we will promote the importance of a healthy lifestyle.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The wellness team will meet in August to review our progress towards Gold Status.</li> <li>2. The wellness champion will attend district supported PD.</li> <li>3. Develop and implement Healthy School Program</li> <li>4. Continue to develop partnership with the 4-H program with our gardens.</li> <li>5. Apply for recognition.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

**#9**

**Title** SWD

**Rationale** Increase the proficiency percentage for students with disabilities (SWD). Our current performance is 24% as measured by FPPI.

**State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** Our students with disabilities ELA proficiency will increase from 24% to 50% by the end of the school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome** Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy** Collaboration between the differentiated needs of each student.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** Our current level of performance is 24% in ELA as measured by the FSA. We believe that the problem/gap is occurring because classroom teachers and ESE teachers need to strategically collaborate and plan specially designed instruction aligned to the students' IEP goals and ensure accommodations are given with fidelity for both assignments and assessments.

**Action Step**

**Description**

1. ESE resource teachers and classroom teachers will strategically and collaboratively plan instruction that is designed to meet students' IEP goals.
2. ESE teachers will give all classroom teachers with SWD, a copy of their students' IEP along with a review of their IEP goals and classroom and assessment accommodations.
3. ESE teachers will intentionally plan for differentiation in small groups lessons, inclusion, co-teaching, activities and support.
4. Students will build stamina by reading grade level texts utilizing reading and test taking strategies.
5. ESE teachers will ensure that accommodations are implemented for all assignments and assessments.
6. PD for all classroom teachers with Linda Mood Bell with VE inclusion students.

**Person Responsible** Robert Ovalle (ovaller@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	<b>Areas of Focus: School wide behavior plan "MAGIC" (Motivation, Achievement, Growth Mindset, Integrity &amp; Cooperation)</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
2	III.A	<b>Areas of Focus: Mathematics</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
3	III.A	<b>Areas of Focus: ELA</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
4	III.A	<b>Areas of Focus: Science</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
5	III.A	<b>Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
6	III.A	<b>Areas of Focus: Attendance</b>				<b>\$2,300.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,300.00
			<i>Notes: Provide attendance incentives for specific students.</i>			
7	III.A	<b>Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
8	III.A	<b>Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
9	III.A	<b>Areas of Focus: SWD</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$2,300.00</b>