
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Ozona Elementary School

601 TAMPA RD, Palm Harbor, FL 34683

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

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Freeman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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)	30%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	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: B 2016-17: B 2015-16: B 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

Create highest student achievement, in a safe environment, using effective learning systems to develop the whole child in collaboration with the community.

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
Freeman, Lisa	Principal
Principal	
Downes, Jessica	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Repetosky, Nicola	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
Danielson, Tammy	Other
Other	
Flood, Marissa	Teacher, PreK
Teacher, PreK	
Light, Michelle	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Hering, Sheryl	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Danneman, Carolyn	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Johnson, Rolanda	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Hollenbeck, Bridgett	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Teig, Jordie	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Miller, Colleen	Teacher, ESE
Teacher, ESE	
Magee, Margaret	Teacher, ESE
Teacher, ESE	
Keller, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Willett, Edward	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	111	125	104	126	109	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	704
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	5	10	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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		2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

43

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	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	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	69%	54%	57%	62%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	59%	58%	47%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	54%	53%	44%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	73%	61%	63%	71%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	70%	61%	62%	66%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	48%	51%	47%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	69%	53%	53%	73%	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	111 (0)	125 (0)	104 (0)	126 (0)	109 (0)	129 (0)	704 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	8 ()	5 ()	10 ()	10 ()	9 ()	42 (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)	2 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	18 (0)	22 (0)	40 (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	71%	56%	15%	58%	13%
	2018	71%	53%	18%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	56%	13%	58%	11%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
	2018	64%	50%	14%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	62%	12%	62%	12%
	2018	70%	62%	8%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	64%	15%	64%	15%
	2018	71%	62%	9%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	68%	60%	8%	60%	8%
	2018	69%	61%	8%	61%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	53%	16%
	2018	72%	57%	15%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	34	50	46	48	60	55	50				
ELL	55			62	80						
HSP	66	71		57	60						
MUL	80			80							
WHT	69	69	57	75	70	55	71				
FRL	53	58	55	60	72	55	53				

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	28	40	36	33	44	40					
ELL	40			50							
HSP	47	32		57	53	40	50				
MUL	91			92							
WHT	63	46	42	72	66	47	76				
FRL	55	50	47	53	52	41	45				

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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	461
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	66
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
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	80
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	67
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	58
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 L25: 58% (+14%)

Math L25: 53% (+6%)

ELA proficiency in 4th (69%) and 5th (67%) compared to 71% in 3rd (for 2 consecutive years)

SWD compared to White ELA: P 34% (-35), LG 50% (-19), L25 46% (-11)

SWD compared to White Math:P 48% (-27), LG 60% (-10), L25 55% (0)

SWD compared to White Science proficiency 50%. -21% when compared to White (71%)

SWD proficiency 49% for ESSA

SWD ELA proficiency up from 28% to 34% (+6), LG from 40% to 50% (+10%), L25 up from 36% to 46% (+10%)

SWD Math proficiency up from 33% to 48% (+15%), LG up from 44% to 60% (+16%), L25 up from 40% to 55% (+11%)

HSP compared to White ELA: P 66% (-3%), LG 71% (+2%), L25 N/A

HSP compared to White Math: P 57% (-18%), LG 60 (-10%). L25 N/A

However:

HSP ELA proficiency up from 47% to 66% (+19%) and LG up from 32% to 71% (+39)

HSP Math proficiency maintained 57% and LG 53% to 60% (+7%)

L25 trending up

SWD trending up; significantly lower than White in ELA P, LG and L25 & Math P, LG

Cohort data reflects integration of knowledge (45%-58%) & ideas and key ideas & details (52-58%) low proficiency

The focus with ESE is on closing foundational skills therefore less exposure to standards based lessons.

Minimal evidence of differentiation of standards-based tasks with planning or instruction during core, not evidenced on walk-throughs

Grade level cohorts lose proficiency from 3rd to 5th (historically)

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

Science proficiency declined from 73% to 69% (-3)

White subgroup declined in Science from 76 to 71 (-5)

During pull out chorus time science was not being taught with fidelity as evidence during ISM/walk-throughs

Therapy pulls from science block

Not meeting the rigor of science standards across grade levels. For example labeling plant parts diagram, growing bean sprouts evidenced KG-3rd.

KG lack science vocabulary knowledge

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

Positive gaps exist for grade levels 3rd-5th in ELA, Math and Science when compared to the state.

In ELA and Math a focus on was placed on standards based instruction, designing tasks aligned to the rigor of standard and releasing students to the task. Biweeklies were utilized 1st-5th to monitor EA & Math standards mastery. Ready FL Reading books were a resource for small group. Professional development was on shifts in the standards. 5th gr Science diagnostic data shared with 3rd & 4th and lessons developed for reteach. Administrative walk-through feedback focused on standards based instruction.

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

ELA Learning gains showed the most improvement from 47% to 69% (+22%).

In addition, L25 ELA increased from 44% to 58% (+14%) and Gifted Students scoring Level 4 or 5 on ELA increased from 68.8% to 84.2% (+15.4%)

Professional Development was focused on standards based instruction, administrative monitoring and feedback was focused on standards. Students were exposed and accountable for reading grade level texts. Biweeklies/formative assessments were utilized to monitor student mastery of standards. Ready reading workbooks were utilized in small group instruction.

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

The amount of Level 1s in 4th (18) and 5th grade (22) for a total of 40.
Attendance, especially in intermediate grades

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

1. ELA Core
2. L25 ELA learning gains
3. SWD ELA proficiency
4. L 25 Math learning gains
5. Science Core

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1**Title**

ELA Core

Our current level of performance is 69% proficient, as evidenced in Spring 2019 FSA ELA results.

We expect our performance level to be 75% proficient by Spring 2020 FSA ELA results.

The problem/gap is occurring because students are not demonstrating mastery of Key Idea & Detail standards and Integration of Knowledge and Ideas standards.

If effective planning of rigorous tasks and instructional delivery around these standards would occur, to include monitoring & adjusting instruction, the problem would be reduced by 6%.

Rationale

Cohorts of students over time are not maintaining grade level proficiency. Key ideas and details standards range from 52% to 58% across 3rd to 5th grade.

Integration of knowledge and ideas percent correct:

3rd: 57%

4th: 54%

5th: 58%

Text based writing percent correct:

4th: 58%

5th: 62%

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 69% to 75% (+6%) as measured by the 2020 FSA ELA. The percent of students in the lowest 25% will increase learning gains from 58% to 65% (+7%) as measured by the 2020 FSA ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Lisa Freeman (freemanl@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 over benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level texts and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

The rationale is based on FSA ELA performance on Main Idea and Key Details and Integration of Knowledge and Ideas standards.

Students need exposure to grade level text and text sets aligned to targeted standards-based tasks. They need to increase their stamina within these texts. Teachers need to plan to strategically, embed texts and intentionally ask overlapping questions, thereby modeling the kind of relationship experienced readers should have with a text--one that is active, rather than passive, one that engages the reader with the main idea and doesn't get overwhelmed with the minutiae. (Reading Reconsidered, A Practical Guide to Rigorous Literacy Instruction by Doug Lemov)

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Utilize grade level texts or above grade level texts as well as the pairing of texts during core while providing opportunities for reading, writing, speaking and listening.2. PLCs/teacher PD focused on building understanding of the standards/rigor in regard to Main Idea & Key Details and Integration of Knowledge & Ideas (bi-weekly)3. Use data to plan instruction that ensure differentiation, intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning4. Monitor exposure to grade level texts during walk-throughs/observations and provide feedback to support teacher growth (Administration)5.. Use module formatives6. Reading Reconsidered (book): 4th and 5th grade PLC focus on chapters related to Main Idea & Key Details and Integration of Knowledge & Ideas, as well as writing to comprehend7. Increase teacher knowledge of state writing expectations.8. Focus instruction on the controlling idea, synthesis of ideas, not formulated writing.9. Monitor that Writing instruction occurs every day to build stamina (Administration)
Person Responsible	Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Math Core
Rationale	<p>Our current level of performance is 73% proficient, as evidence in Spring 2019 FSA Math results.</p> <p>We expect our performance level to be 80% proficient by Spring 2020 FSA Math results.</p> <p>The problem/gap is occurring because students are not demonstrating mastery of Measurement, Data & Geometry, Numbers & Operations-Fractions and Numbers & Operations in Base Ten.</p> <p>L 25 learning gains is 53% (compared to learning gains 70%)</p> <p>If we were to strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks, and ensure staff understanding of how teaching should move from conceptual to procedural to real world as a means to define rigor the problem would be reduced by 7%.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 73% to 80% (+7%) as measured by the 2020 FSA Math. The percent of students in the lowest 25 percentile will increase from 53% to 60% (+7%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning and Number Routines. Support this work through curriculum meetings, PLCs, feedback and/or the use of classroom video.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We have been successful with math instruction, however the use of this strategy will provide instruction to ensure differentiation, intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mathematics Teacher Leaders are identified and participating in MTLI Cohort 3 2. MTLI will be supported by math coach 3. Teachers will collaborate and select tasks aligned to the rigor of the standards 4. Teachers utilize digital comprehension check in Ready Math and/or lesson quizzes to monitor mastery of standards (bi weekly). For example teachers are about to teach lesson 1 and lesson 2 they create a 5-6 question quiz from bank then in 2 weeks administer quiz. Adjust instruction based on data. 5. Teachers regularly assess formally and informally--MAP, Unit Assessments (6), digital comprehension check (6-8)-- then utilize data to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach. 6. Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth.

**Person
Responsible**

Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

#3

Title	Science core
Rationale	<p>Our current level of performance is 69% proficient as evidenced in Spring 2019 SSA results. This is 4% decrease from Spring 2018 SSA results. We expect our performance level to be 75% proficient in Spring 2020 SSA results.</p> <p>The problem/gap is occurring because students are not mastering 3rd and 4th grade standards as evidence on the district diagnostic. Plants, Rocks, Weathering & Erosion (4th) and Light (3rd) are the lowest scoring standards. This is occurring because science core instruction is not following the 10-70-20 routine each day. Standards are not being taught to the rigor of the standard. Teaching of fifth grade standards is compromised in order to re-teach 3rd & 4th grade standards.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of fifth grade students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 69% to 75% (+6%) as measured by the 2020 SSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Downes (downesj@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, 20% confirming the learning) and include the appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignment to the 1st-5th grade standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students must receive consistent, effective instruction that promotes student centered activities (lab), increase domain specific vocabulary. Walk-through indicate science being taught at the same level of rigor across grade levels. District diagnostic identifies Plants, Rocks, Weathering & Erosion and Light as low mastery standards.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administer the 3rd & 4th grade Review Diagnostic Assessment, 5th grade team leader will share the results with 3rd & 4th grade for planning of instruction. 2. Use Diagnostic Review to plan re-teach lessons 3. Purchase and post 60 Science Power Words 4. Lesson focus will be on "confirming the learning"--lessons will have checkpoints and critical questions to monitor mastery and adjust instruction as needed. 5. Administrators will monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth in the teaching to the depth of the grade level standards. 6. Administrators monitor grade level standards by SLAGs, this will allow for differentiation by grade level 7. 4th and 5th grade take unit assessments and identify low proficiency standards and embed into 5th grade science review plan.
--------------------	---

8. Teachers utilize teacher resource guide for instructional strategies and Administrators monitor instruction.

Person Responsible Jessica Downes (downesj@pcsb.org)

#4

Title Bridging the Gap (Black Student Achievement)
 Our black students demonstrated a proficiency rate of 40% in ELA compared to 69% proficiency demonstrated by the White students as measured by 2019 FSA ELA.

Rationale Our black students demonstrated a proficiency rate of 40% in Math compared to 75% proficiency demonstrated by White students as measured by the 2019 FSA Math.
 0 of the 2 black students met proficiency on 2019 SSA Science.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve Increase the percent of African American students scoring proficient from 40% to 65% (+25%) as measured by the 2020 FSA ELA.
 Increase the percent of African American students scoring proficient from 40% to 65% (+25%) as measured by the 2020 FSA Math.
 Increase the number of African American students meeting proficiency from 0% to 75% (6 out of 8) as measured by the 2020 SSA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy Ensure instructional supports are in place for African American students that are equitable and culturally relevant during core and small group instruction. These support include utilization of the 6 Ms, restorative practices, grade level texts as well as small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy African American students will be more engaged in learning, motivated to complete work and develop stronger relationships with teachers and classmates. Culturally Responsive Instruction and Restorative Practices within our classrooms will result in classrooms that are more responsive the academic, social and emotional needs of our black students.

Action Step

Description 1. Integrate CRI strategies into PLCs and staff meeting
 2. Monitor classrooms for implementation of CRI through walk-throughs and observation providing feedback related to fidelity.
 3. Secure mentors
 4.
 5.

Person Responsible Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	Conditions for Learning Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 49 referrals.
Rationale	<p>KG: 3 1st: 9 2nd: 5 3rd: 5 4th: 10 5th: 14</p> <p>Risk ratio: Black 1.29 Hispanic: 1.69 Compared to white: .87</p> <p>The problem/gap is occurring due to is a need for consistency across school of Tier 1 PBIS/Guidelines for Success and Restorative Practices. We need build capacity for implementation across all grades, including cafe and specials.</p>

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of students receiving referrals will decrease from 49 to 20 students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tammy Danielson (danielsona@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the implementation of research-based practices in restorative practices that communicate high expectations for each student. Support the implementation of engagement strategies to support the development of social and instructional teaching. Support the development and/or implementation of school-wide equitable practices that engage students in acknowledging and adhering to processes/procedures/GfS.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If the implementation of Restorative practice, SEL and Culturally Relevant Instruction is done with fidelity, referrals would be reduced to a more equitable referral risk ratio as evidenced by restorative practices research by IIRP.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure all teaching staff receive RP training and ongoing PD 2. Develop a well defined process that integrates RP across the PBIS continuum 3. Ensure the school-wide discipline plan and classroom discipline plans include restorative language, questioning, etc. 4. Develop a clear discipline/referral process for both teachers and students utilize the staff Behavior Handbook 5. Within SBLT, analyze and review data quarterly to identify progress, areas for improvement, trends and next steps.

Person Responsible Tammy Danielson (danielsona@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	<p>The '18-'19 attendance rate for all students is 95.8%. With 10% of students missing 10% or more. 3% of our students are absent 20% or more Black: 23% (absent 20% or more) 31% (absent 10% or more) Hispanic: 12% (absent 20% or more) 15% (absent 10% or more) White: 3% (absent 20% or more) 9% (absent 10% or more) The problem/gap is occurring due to medical issues/outside therapies and conflict with parent schedule.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Our current attendance rate is 95.8% as evidenced by Focus, our current record keeping system. Our attendance rate will increase to 97%. We will decrease our number of students absent 10% or more from 10% to 5% (-5%) 3% of our students are absent 20% or more. Students absent 20% or more will decrease from 3% to 0%, unless an emergency medical situations occurs.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Downes (downesj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Child Study Team (CST) will monitor attendance at bi-weekly meetings. A process for teacher contact will be in place and monitored. Teacher to call parent if child absent 3 days within a semester.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Increase communication regarding attendance between teacher and parent as positive approach.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attendance process will be shared with staff at preschool and throughout via email 2. CST meets bi-weekly with a focus on students who fell in the 20% or more range the prior year 3. Students missing 3 or more days will be contacted by the classroom teacher 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Jessica Downes (downesj@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Family and Community Engagement
Rationale	partnerships with families and the community are an integral part of creating a a positive school climate and assuring high academic achievement for all students.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Meet requirements for the attainment of The 5 Star Award.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure business and community partners are aware of a variety of opportunities for involvement before, during and after school to support student success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Increase the number of volunteer hours and build and retain business partnerships.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Family & Community Liaison to contact local businesses to seek mentors and business partnerships 2. Hold volunteer training & fingerprinting in August/early Sept. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	<p>In '18-'19 Ozona Elementary achieved Healthy Schools Bronze status. Ozona Elementary staff and students can begin planning the action steps to reach Silver status for '19-'20.</p> <p>The problem/gap is occurring because of lack of evidence of implementation for the last 3 modules. If modules are reviewed and we implement more opportunities for focusing on healthy food/movement, and plan events accordingly the problem would be reduced by meeting additional modules.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of modules we receive recognition on will increase from 3 to 4 to allow us to continue to grow towards meeting 6 out of 6 modules within the next two years as measured by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Nicola Repetosky (repetoskyn@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	An action plan to implement healthy activities/options for students and staff throughout the school year as well as a timeline will be created by the school based Healthy Schools Team to begin modules that will increase our status.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>By creating an action plan with clear steps Gold status can be reached within two years.</p> <p>According to the article Health and Academic Achievement from the CDC, "schools, health agencies, parents and communities share a common goal of supporting the link between healthy eating, physical activity, and improved academic achievement of children and adolescents."</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Healthy School team will develop an action plan at the beginning of the school year. The plan will be monitored each semester. 2. Healthy Schools team will present plan to PTA/SAC and staff 3. Involve PTA in supporting health activities such as Move-a-thon and Girls on the Run. 4. Cafeteria Team will promote healthy eating/nutrition. 5. Physical Education teachers will utilize the District curriculum for health and physical activity by May 2020.
Person Responsible	Nicola Repetosky (repetoskyn@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	ESE ELA and Math
Rationale	<p>Our current level of performance for SWD is 34% proficient as evidenced in Spring 2019 FSA ELA. Our current level of performance for SWD is 48% proficient as evidenced in Spring 2019 FSA Math. The problem/ gap is occurring because students lack foundational skills and stamina for grade level rigorous tasks. Testing/assessments rely heavily on reading comprehension. Specifically designed instruction and differentiated instruction for ESE students is lacking.</p> <p>SWD ELA proficiency up from 28% to 34%(+6), LG from 40% to 50% (+10), L25 up from 36% to 46% (+10%) SWD Math proficiency up from 33% to 48% (+15%), LG up from 44% to 60% (+16), L25 up from 40% to 55% (+11)</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>The percent of SWD students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 34% to 40% (+6%) as measured by the 2020 FSA ELA. The percent of SWD students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 48% to 55% (+7%) as measured by the 202 FSA Math.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Margaret Magee (mageem@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students requiring ESE services work toward mastery of 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	Research strategies according to Vahughn, Bos and Schumm 2007, Marzano, et. al., 2001: Tomlison and McTighte 2006, suggest various ways to increase learning for ESE students by: using a combination of direct instruction and cognitive strategy instruction, teach in small interactive groups, extend practice and application of skills/concepts, use "think" aloud techniques, and present learning in multiple ways.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administrators and ESE teachers will will implement a process for placing students requiring ESE services in master schedules first in order to optimize service delivery. 2. ESE and classroom teachers will ensure ESE students have access to grade level texts, rigorous tasks, materials and content. 3. ESE and classroom teachers will use evidence-based practices for students with disabilities to teach foundational literacy and math skills as as a pathway to grade level work on an on-going basis 4. Quarterly VE Resource teachers will observe students within the classroom and provide feedback to classroom teacher on practices to increase engagement and rigor of ESE students, 5.

Person Responsible Margaret Magee (mageem@pcsb.org)

#10

Title Gifted Students

Rationale Our current Gifted students level of performance is 84.2% level 4 or level 5 as evidenced by Spring 2019 FSA ELA.
Our current Gifted students level of performance is 89.5% level 4 or level 5 as evidenced by Spring 2020 FSA Math.

This is above the state and district average for ELA & Math. However our gifted population is decreasing due to the opening of a local gifted center.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve The percent of Gifted students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 84% to 90% (+6%) level 4 or level 5 as measured by the 2020 FSA ELA.
The percent of Gifted students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 89.5% to 95% level 4 or level 5 as measured by the 2020 FSA Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy Clustering of Gifted students grades 4th and 5th.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Research supports cluster grouping when students are paired with gifted knowledgeable teachers, and differentiation has been shown to better meet the needs of gifted learners and provide opportunities for growth.
(The Cluster Grouping handbook: How to Challenge Gifted Students and Improve Achievement for All, Winebrenner & Brulles)

Action Step

Description

1. Intentional cluster grouping of gifted learners in grades 4 & 5
2. Teachers engaging in gifted micro-credential and/or gifted endorsement
3. Planned Intentional differentiation for gifted learners is reflected in lessons, monitored with Administrators' feedback
4. PD for ELA differentiation for gifted learners
5. Administrators recommend that Deliberate Practice Plan incorporate opportunities for growth in the area of differentiating for gifted learners

Person Responsible Lisa Freeman (freemanl@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 Core				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	3071 - Ozona Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Money will fund substitutes so that teachers can collaboratively plan and attend PD</i>			
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Math Core				\$700.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	3071 - Ozona Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$700.00
			<i>Notes: Subs for TDEs MTLI walk-throughs, working with the coach, collaborative planning</i>			
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Science core				\$400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	3071 - Ozona Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$400.00
			<i>Notes: Money to purchase science power words, TDEs for 5th gr planning</i>			
4	III.A	Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap (Black Student Achievement)				\$300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	3071 - Ozona Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$300.00
			<i>Notes: Money to support CRT training</i>			
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: Conditions for Learning				\$400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	3071 - Ozona Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$400.00
			<i>Notes: Money will support Restorative Practice, Equity & Responsive Learning</i>			
6	III.A	Areas of Focus: Attendance				\$105.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	239-Other	3071 - Ozona Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$105.00

						<i>Notes: Attendance incentives</i>
7	III.A	Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement				\$300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	239-Other	3071 - Ozona Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$100.00
						<i>Notes: supplies/materials for academic family nights</i>
	5100	239-Other	3071 - Ozona Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$100.00
						<i>Notes: supplies/materials for academic family nights</i>
	5100	239-Other	3071 - Ozona Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$100.00
						<i>Notes: supplies/materials for academic family nights</i>
8	III.A	Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools				\$100.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	239-Other	3071 - Ozona Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$100.00
						<i>Notes: Incentives to be healthy, recess equipment</i>
9	III.A	Areas of Focus: ESE ELA and Math				\$550.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			3071 - Ozona Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$550.00
						<i>Notes: Monies for ESE Teacher TDEs for PD, support of gen ed teachers-- observation of instruction, data analysis, materials</i>
10	III.A	Areas of Focus: Gifted Students				\$550.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	239-Other	3071 - Ozona Elementary School	Other		\$550.00
						<i>Notes: Materials, PD for gifted cluster, TDEs/subs, collaborative planning</i>
Total:						\$3,405.00