Pinellas County Schools

Pasadena Fundamental Elementary School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pasadena Fundamental Elementary School

95 72ND ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33710

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

Demographics

Principal: Donita Moody

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2019

2018-19 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A
ESSA Status	N/A

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

100% Student Success

Provide the school's vision statement

Pasadena Fundamental School is a school of choice that creates a safe, fundamental learning environment where faculty, staff, parents, and community work in partnership to foster highest student achievement.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Moody, Donita	Principal
Principal	
Harvey, Christina	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
White, Kristen	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Leonard, Brianne	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Cooper, Anita	Other
Other	
Yeomans, Charlotte	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	

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	70	72	72	72	85	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	5	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	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	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

24

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/11/2019

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	4	6	2	2	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	80%	54%	57%	75%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	74%	59%	58%	55%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	80%	54%	53%	50%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	85%	61%	63%	87%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	77%	61%	62%	71%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	48%	51%	63%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	82%	53%	53%	77%	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	70 (0)	72 (0)	72 (0)	72 (0)	85 (0)	89 (0)	460 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	4 ()	5 ()	2 ()	2 ()	2 ()	15 (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)	2 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	7 (0)	7 (0)	15 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	82%	56%	26%	58%	24%
	2018	76%	53%	23%	57%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	56%	17%	58%	15%
	2018	82%	51%	31%	56%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	84%	54%	30%	56%	28%
	2018	68%	50%	18%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	82%	62%	20%	62%	20%
	2018	89%	62%	27%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	64%	21%	64%	21%
	2018	86%	62%	24%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	86%	60%	26%	60%	26%
	2018	88%	61%	27%	61%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	82%	54%	28%	53%	29%
	2018	77%	57%	20%	55%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	43	85	82	64	79		55				
BLK	64	64		71	45						

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
HSP	82	71		75	64						
MUL	83	73		83	82						
WHT	81	75	82	88	80	72	82				
FRL	70	74	90	76	73	70	73				

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	33	42		53	42						
ASN	80			100							
BLK	54	45		77	60						
HSP	91	50		82	64						
MUL	65	36		82	70						
WHT	75	58	48	89	72	67	80				
FRL	66	50	53	80	71	65	50				

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	77
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	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	68
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

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

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

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	73
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	80
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	75
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

Math Gains L25 showed the lowest performance for 2018-2019 (60%)

There is a need for additional training and planning to support the core curriculum to meet the needs of individual learners. ie: ESE, gifted,
ESSA Scores indicate that our ESE subgroup in need of more individualized support during instruction
ESSA Scores indicate that our Black/African American subgroup would benefit from (CRT) culturally relevant teaching strategies to improve student outcomes.

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

Math Gains L25 scores showed the greatest decline from 63% to - 60%

There is a need for monitoring the implementation of problem base learning to fidelity. ie; student centered instruction, math talk evident
There is a need for additional training and planning to support the core curriculum to meet the needs of individual learners. ie: ESE, gifted,
ESSA Scores indicate that our ESE subgroup in need of more individualized support during instruction
ESSA Scores indicate that our Black/African American subgroup would benefit from (CRT) culturally relevant teaching strategies to improve student outcomes.

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

Pasadena out performed the state in ELA by 23 points and Math pay 22 points

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

ELA Gains L25 showed the most improvement.

MAP PD Differentiated Instruction/Small Group Instruction based on data
Just In Time ELA Professional Development
Visited High Performing school
Peer Coaching/ELA Champion Work

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

We will continue to focus on improving attendance.

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

1. Increase Math Gains L25 (60%)
2. Increase ELA Gains (74%)
3. Increase Math Gains (77%)
4. Increase ELA Gains L25 (80%)
5. Increase ELA Achievement Level (80%)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA/Reading Goal
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 80% proficient, as evidenced by FSA. We expect our performance level to be 90% by Summer 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 80% to 90%, as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources. 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 benchmark.These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem/gap is occurring due to the lack of fidelity in implementing instruction with rigorous tasks. If fidelity of implementation of rigorous task would occur, the problem would be reduced by 10%.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers strengthen core instruction by increasing the amount of time students are engaged in reading by closely and critically re-reading complex text, writing speaking and listening. Gradually release the responsibility of learning. 2. Ensure students have ample time every day to practice independently what is taught in reading and writing, allowing for strategic practice as well as building stamina for longer projects across the grade levels and calendar year. 3. Teachers monitor and provide students with targeted, actionable feedback to support learning, leaving students ambitious agendas

	(goals) that will last across the week. 4. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. (Teachers use state assessments, district provided assessments, observational data, anecdotal record keeping, FACs (formative Assessment Checks), and teacher created informal assessments to monitor student progress.)
Person Responsible	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Mathematics Goal
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 85% level 3 or above, as evidenced in FSA. We expect our performance level to be 95% by Summer 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving math proficiency will increase from 85% to 95%, as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donita Moody (moodyd@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	The problem/gap is occurring due to lack of fidelity in implementing problem based rigorous tasks incorporating student centered instruction. The problem/gap is occurring due to lack of fidelity in implementing problem based rigorous tasks incorporating student centered instruction.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the Standards for Mathematical Practice and rigorous performance tasks aligned to the Mathematics Florida Standards (MAFS). Just In Time Coaching and Collaborative Planning Hubs 2. Teachers use lesson planning tools to plan purposeful questions based on anticipated student solutions and misconceptions. TQE lesson tool 3. Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning. 4. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment (e.g., MFAS tasks) and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions. Weekly Assessments-Digital Comprehension Checks or Lesson Quizzes (paper pencil) 5. Conduct regular Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and plan for instruction based on data.

6. Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention and
enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance.

Person Responsible	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science Goal
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 82%, as evidenced in SSA. We expect our performance level to be 92% by Summer 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of 5th grade students achieving proficiency will increase from 82% to 92% as measured by SSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources. Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. Monitor for consistent effective instruction that promotes student centered rigor for all science labs grades 1-5
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem/gap is occurring due to lack of fidelity of 10-70-20 instructional models across grade levels. If there is fidelity of implementing 10-70-20 , the problem would be reduced by 10%
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers 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 includes appropriate grade-level utilization of science labs in alignment with the Standards. 2. Utilize diagnostic data to identify instructional resources to support the ongoing review and expansion of learning with an emphasis on informational text and academic vocabulary. Give unit assessments in 4th and 5th grade. Identify low performing standards and embed in Review Plan. 3. Teachers use BOAST (Bring On Any Science Test) vocabulary. 4. Monitor and develop support plans for teachers not exhibiting routine practice of the 10-70-20 science instructional model inclusive of support provided by school-based mentors or request district science coach support.

Person Responsible Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Bridging the Gap Plan (Black Achievement)
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 64% Black/African American scored level 3 and above compared to 81% white students, as evidenced in ELA FSA 2019. We expect our performance level to be 79% Black/African American scoring level 3 and above for ELA by Spring 2020. The learning gains will be 100%. Our current level of performance is 45% Black/African American made a learning gain in Math compared to 80% white students, as evidenced in Math FSA 2019.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of black students proficient in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade will increase to 79%, as measured by FSA. The percent of black students making a learning gain in Math will increase to 60%, as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure equitable representation of black learners in school awards/ recognition ceremonies. Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans. Ensure staff has access to real-time data specific to black students in order to have effective data chats and targeted support for improved learning. Ensure black students are participating in extended learning opportunities before and after school and in extended school year programs through recruitment and targeted resources. Implement universal screening for gifted identification to expand the number of black students served within the talent development groups or identified as gifted learners. Implement Restorative Practices throughout the school. Conduct monthly discipline disparity/restorative practices

	training with school administrators and staff. Utilize supports from district office to ensure interventions are in place and being implemented for black students who receive consent for evaluation. Utilize supports from district office to support the recruitment and retention of black applicants.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem/gap is occurring because targeted support for improved learning is needed. If targeted support would occur, the problem would be reduced by 10%.
Action Step	
Description	1. Monitor and provide feedback on the use of oral language and storytelling, cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, morning meetings, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans. 2. Monitor effectiveness of intervention strategies and make adjustments based on student progress. Develop a system to monitor student participation in enrichment opportunities and digital resources and make adjustments based on data 3. AVID CRT, Restorative Practices, Equity based professional development will be embedded during pre-school and throughout the year. Instructional leaders will monitor and provide feedback around these three areas.
Person Responsible	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Our current attendance rate is 4% of all students are absent more than 10%. We expect our performance level to be 2% by June 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students missing more than 10% of school will decrease from 4% to 2%, as measured by school profile data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all Tiers on an ongoing basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If parents have an understanding of attendance policies) the problem would be reduced by 2%. We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation of our strategies by monitoring school profile data.
Action Step	
Description	1. Review attendance taking process and school-wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff. 2. Asset map the attendance resources, interventions and incentives at our school to support increased attendance for each Tier. 3. Develop and implement attendance incentive programs and competitions. 4. Engage students and families in attendance related activities to ensure they are knowledgeable of the data and aware of the importance of attendance. 5. Review data and effectiveness of school-wide attendance strategies on a bi-weekly basis. Implement Tier 2 and 3 plans for student specific needs and review barriers and effectiveness on a bi-weekly 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	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Family Community Engagement
Rationale	1. Effectively communicate with families about their students' progress and school processes/practices. 2. Provide academic tools to families in support of their students' achievement at home. 3. Purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to advocate for their students. 4. Intentionally build positive relationships with families and community partners.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The total number of volunteer hours will increase from 7126 to 8000 by May 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Conduct regular data chats with parents/students to discuss student progress (FSA scale score), MAP, Grade-level standards). Utilize social media to increase communication with parents; PCS family Engagement APP; Facebook, etc. Parent/family meetings to communicate school and classroom processes and procedures. • Required Conferences (3 times per year) • Student Agendas/Planners • Social Media
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	When families, schools, and communities work effectively together, engagement becomes a powerful tool that boosts student achievement and better prepares our children to lead healthy, happy and productive lives.
Action Step	
Description	1. Provide academic workshops (Face-to-Face; Webinars) for parents to increase student support at home. (Parent University, Student Led Conference) 2. Provide families/parents with academic tools/ resources on a regular basis. (Tutoring, Clever Applications: iStation Dreambox, Khan Academy, Myon) 3. Provide parents/families opportunity to attend workshops and training, join webinars, and organizations that promote parent advocacy. (PTA, Donuts for Parents, Book Fair , Family Night, Winter and Spring Concerts) 4. Utilize student services to provide families/parents, and students with resources, tools, triage support, outside agencies referrals.

Person Responsible	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	1. Our current level of performance is 6 out of 6 modules eligible for bronze, as evidenced in the Alliance for a Healthier Generation, Healthy Schools Program Framework. 2. We expect our performance level to maintain 6 out of 6 modules eligible bronze by May 2020
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our school will be eligible in 6 out of 6 modules for bronze recognition by May 2020 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Framework.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. The school will ensure stake holder buy in with following the Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Framework. 2. The problem/gap is occurring because lack of physical activity outside of the classroom, food served to staff does not always meet USDA requirements.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If our healthy school team can monitor the implementation of administrative guidelines for wellness, our school would have a greater opportunity to be eligible for recognition.

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. Complete the SMART Snacks in School Documentation 3. Update Healthy Schools Program Assessment 4. Apply for Recognition
Person Responsible	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Gifted
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 72% of students scored Level 4 & Level 5, as evidenced in ELA FSA 2019. We expect our performance level to be 82% by Spring 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of gifted students earning level 4 and 5 will increase from 72% to 82%, as measured by ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of every student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem/gap is occurring because targeted differentiated instruction/enrichment is needed for gifted learners. If targeted differentiated instruction/enrichment would occur, the problem would be reduced by 10%.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers/Staff obtain the gifted micro-credential and/or the gifted endorsement so they can better engage gifted learners in complex tasks. 2. Differentiate for gifted learners through adapting content, thinking skills, resources, and/or objectives. 3. Plan for tiered learning to utilize questions with varying “Depth of Knowledge”
Person Responsible	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	Conditions for Learning
Rationale	Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is two students earned referrals. We expect our performance level to be zero referrals earned by May 2019.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of all students receiving referrals will decrease from two to zero as measured by school profile data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Support the implementation engagement strategies that support the development of social and instructional teaching practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because strategies are needed to address the diversity of each student. The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because strategies are needed to address the diversity of each student.
Action Step	
Description	1. Facilitate teacher/staff learning within PLCs, PD opportunities for PBIS/Restorative Practice 2. Facilitate AVID CRT Training 3. Create learning environment where students feel they belong and are welcomed. 4. Equity with Excellence for All Training.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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/Reading Goal**				**$1,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			3281 - Pasadena Fundamental Elem.			$1,000.00
			Notes: TDEs will be provided to collaborate and participate in data driven discussion and decision making.			
2	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Mathematics Goal**				**$1,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			3281 - Pasadena Fundamental Elem.			$1,000.00

			Notes: TDEs will be provided to collaborate and participate in data driven discussion and decision making.			
3	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Science Goal**				**$0.00**
4	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap Plan (Black Achievement)**				**$0.00**
5	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Attendance**				**$320.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			3281 - Pasadena Fundamental Elem.			$320.00
			Notes: Student Incentives aligned to PBIS			
6	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Family Community Engagement**				**$0.00**
7	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools**				**$0.00**
8	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Gifted**				**$0.00**
9	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Conditions for Learning**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$2,320.00**