Ponce De Leon Elementary School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ponce De Leon Elementary School

1301 PONCE DE LEON BLVD, Clearwater, FL 33756

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

Demographics

Principal: Tracie Bergman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2018

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: F 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: D 2013-14: F
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

We are committed to:
*Develop tolerance in all students
*Provide a structured, safe learning environment
*Instill the belief that all students can learn
*Link standard based instruction to real world world application
*Teach students to persevere when faced with challenges
*Ensure continuous learning for all

Provide the school's vision statement

We are dedicated to building a community of successful problem solvers who are prepared to be responsible citizens and celebrate diversity.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Bostick, Sadra	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Bergman, Tracie	Principal
Principal	
Hudson, Dolores	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Neugebauer, Fran	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Goza, Jennifer	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Oij, Heather	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	

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	54	75	76	89	72	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	448
Attendance below 90 percent	0	23	25	14	80	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	26	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	2	2	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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)
27

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 7/26/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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	20	38	19	25	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	21	38	20	9	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	48	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

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	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	30	27	18	26	20	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	30	40	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	9	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	41%	54%	57%	30%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	59%	58%	31%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	54%	53%	24%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	46%	61%	63%	39%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	44%	61%	62%	32%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	48%	51%	21%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	49%	53%	53%	36%	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	54 (0)	75 (0)	76 (0)	89 (0)	72 (0)	82 (0)	448 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	23 (20)	25 (38)	14 (19)	80 (25)	14 (18)	156 (120)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (2)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (21)	0 (38)	3 (20)	2 (9)	0 (27)	5 (115)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	26 (48)	37 (44)	67 (92)

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	43%	56%	-13%	58%	-15%
	2018	26%	53%	-27%	57%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	25%	56%	-31%	58%	-33%
	2018	25%	51%	-26%	56%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	36%	54%	-18%	56%	-20%
	2018	27%	50%	-23%	55%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	39%	62%	-23%	62%	-23%
	2018	35%	62%	-27%	62%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	64%	-26%	64%	-26%
	2018	41%	62%	-21%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	43%	60%	-17%	60%	-17%
	2018	32%	61%	-29%	61%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	43%	54%	-11%	53%	-10%
	2018	36%	57%	-21%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	42	51	50	43	49	50	35				
ELL	34	52	43	41	40	25	44				
BLK	41	50	44	41	52	45	38				
HSP	38	52	46	45	41	27	43				
WHT	40	52		53	43		69				
FRL	37	49	48	43	43	32	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	21	23	25	25	26	32	20				
ELL	23	21	14	35	26		21				
BLK	25	27	23	32	28	23	19				
HSP	26	28	19	40	22	10	27				
WHT	37	37		40	40	30	63				
FRL	26	30	24	37	33	24	31				

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	48
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	380
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
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	44
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	45
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	51
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	47
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 learning gains of the lowest 25% was the area of lowest performance. This was reflected in both our Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) data and our Measurement of Annual Progress (MAP assessment) January data. It did improve 14 points from the previous year, but continues to be the lowest point. Teachers still need to get a better grasp on the standards themselves and use more of the text specs, question stems and language from the FSA during instruction. All aspects of the shifts and teachers limited understanding led to this area continuing to be a struggle. We need to focus more on studying not just the standards but the major work of the grade and understand how the standards connect across grade levels. In addition, they need to develop a better understanding of the aspects of rigor within the standards and teach into the conceptual understanding with rich math problems. Intervention groups also need to be consistently held and grounded in data based upon the interim assessments.

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

None of the data this year declined from the previous year. We had increases across all 7 cells. However the subgroup data shows that we continue to have a gap in the performance of the students with disabilities. These students are served in the general education classroom with Varying Exceptionalities (VE) resource support in reading, math or both. Both areas indicate a gap and it was evident across all grade levels. Staffing was one key factor in that the staff shifted throughout the year in terms of supports, substitutes and the .5 unit. This led to an inconsistency of quality services for the students. Another factor is the level of knowledge the VE teachers have in regards to the grade level standards and how to assist students by scaffolding up as opposed to differentiating down. Most services were listed as similar for students on the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) in terms of Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) and the minutes required and they were primarily provided during the intervention block in a small group. Math was provided haphazardly with limited planning on the VE teachers' parts. There needs to be a better balance of closing skill gaps while still supporting grade level materials in both math and english/language arts (ELA).

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

Fourth grade ELA and math had the largest gaps when compared to the district/state average. Classroom Culture and implementing strong processes and systems for teaching and learning in 3 out of 4 classrooms was a struggle. In one classroom, the struggling students did not make any gains, and the overall group of students remained below proficiency. An interventionist was put into place for that classroom at the 90 day point but still there was limited movement. But yet the interventionist had success in a second room, where 50% of the lowest 25 made gains in both areas. Another classroom had a teacher shift mid year and while all the students moved with in the bucket, it was not enough movement qualified for a gain. Fourth graders really struggled with key ideas and details and while they did well in writing, it was not enough to compensate for the actual reading gap. This is a base standard necessary to do well in the integration category and without strength in it, they did not get many of the higher weighted questions correct. In math, the students struggled reading and comprehending what the problems were asking them to do.They also seemed to lack skills in fractions and algebraic thinking, meaning they need more time on number routines and building conceptual understanding of key place value concepts. Teachers struggled with teaching into student misconceptions, rather monitored more for compliance than understanding. Feedback was not always evident.

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

ELA proficiency and gains overall showed the most improvement. One new action our team took was implementing interim assessments in grades 3-5 aligned to the focus standard for the cycle. Once the standard was taught, the assessment was given. The students then were grouped based on performance and worked with the teacher in grade level text to remediate misconceptions and dig deeper into the questions stems before retaking the assessment. Another action our team took was to increase the amount of grade level text put in front of students. Teachers planned aligned units together involving paired text. They then used the concept of backwards design to align text dependent questions to the standards and to plan for exit tickets aligned to the test specs. This helped them build a strong understanding of the ELA standards. Another action taken was was a systematic approach to planning for instruction. ELA planning was weekly, facilitated by the coach. They reviewed opm data, looked at the standards and planned for instruction that focused on a balance between the gradual release and student centered learning. Thinking Maps and writing strategies were also incorporated. Students also read various chapter books as a shared reading, and these texts were used to build stamina and understanding of complex text.

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

The number of Level one students in fourth and fifth grade is still a large amount despite the gains made this year. This means that these students will need quite a bit of points to make a learning gain next year and a plan must be developed specifically for them in order to see large movement in performance. This is especially true with our incoming fifth graders. who will count specifically for learning gains. A second area of concern, connected to the number of Level 1 students is attendance. We have students that are struggling, largely because of attendance and we need to develop a tight schoolwide process to reward students, motivate them for coming and build tighter relationship with families so that they understand the importance of having their child in school.

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

1. Improve the performance in all areas of the Exceptional Student Education (ESE) subgroup served in the general education classroom so that at least 55% of the subgroup is either proficient or makes a learning gain
2. Increase the performance of the Lowest 25 percent in math so that at least 55% make a gain.
3. Improve overall proficiency in ELA and Math which will inevitably lead to gains in both areas.
4. Decrease the number of Level one students in both ELA and Math so that less than 25% of the students tested fall into this category.
5. Improve the attendance rate so that only 20% of the students total are below the 90% rate from 35%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	culture and climate centered around creating high expectations for both teaching and learning
Rationale	This past year our school focused heavily on building a positive culture where student learning was a priority, where strong positive relationships existed between adults and students, and where staff collaborated together with each other to plan for high quality, rigorous instruction. We earned a gain of 102 points total with this focus. So this year it is time for us to continue to build that culture but this time with an emphasis on creating and maintaining high expectations for teaching and learning. Included in this focus is the need for consistent monitoring of student progress and acting upon gaps in student achievement in the moment rather than simply monitoring for compliance. We also need to continue to develop an understanding of the standards in order to hold students accountable to the depth of the standards. Positive Behavior Support (PBIS) will continue play a primary role in our school structure.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science will reach at least 55%, with gains in all areas, including the L25 also reaching a minimum of 55% in each category so that our school can reach the ultimate goal of gaining a B school grade. In addition, we will continue to increase our Federal Index to 50 as part of our Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) measure, and meet all subgroup requirements with scores of at least 50 in all subgroups. Our attendance rate will also increase to 95% from 92%. Our Tier 1 PBIS walk through data will consistently remain at 80% so that we can pursue the PBIS model school award.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tracie Bergman (bergmant@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	1.Monitor learning closely through the use of interim assessments, formative assessments, conferring, questioning and student self-monitoring strategies. Use this ongoing data to drive the instructional focus for all groups of students. 2. Continue to close the achievement gap between white students and other subgroups through Advancement via Individual Determination (AVID) strategies, Social Emotional Learning (SEL) and Culturally Responsive teaching (CRT) strategies at the same time building an understanding of equity school wide. 3. Create student centered learning environments with rigor in every classroom through the use of engagement strategies, collaborative structures, higher order questioning, and collaborative planning where lessons and units are developed with the end task in mind. 4. Strengthen the school wide culture in all areas through the continued consistent implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS), Restorative Practices. Introduce the Social Emotional curriculum Strong Kids, Strong Start. 5. Connect with families to strengthen their understanding of academics/ attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	1.Teacher evaluations showed that there was a lack of understanding of how to monitor students for instruction. Misconceptions were not planned for and interventions were not provided on the spot. 2. FSA Data-ESE, ELL, Hispanic and Black students showed a gap in proficiency when compared to white students. Strategies that motivate ALL students and provide them access to content will help close this gap. We need to develop a better understanding of the students we serve. 3. Walk throughs-Student collaboration didn't deepen understanding. AVID self-Assessment-need to increase use of varied collaborative structures. Staff Survey-Teachers need time to develop detailed lessons and think through them with an understanding of the end goal. 4. Tier 1 PBIS/Benchmark of Quality data-implementation dip to 75% in spring. Consistency needed in morning meetings. SEL will assist in creating positive culture for learning. 5. Parent Survey/Attendance data-Attendance rate declined, Parent relationships need strengthening/reinforcement. School needs branding.

Action Step

Description	1. Develop Instructional Focus calendar, including interim assessment dates .Provide time in collaborative planning for teachers to review data and create corrective reteaching plans. Provide PD on formative assessment and monitoring strategies. Build into lesson plans across all subjects. Develop tools such as checklists, forms or color coding tools to assist teachers in keeping track of student progress. Provide Professional Development (PD) on student self-monitoring strategies. Discuss in planning. Implement with embedded coach support. Walk through and provide feedback. Share student data regularly with teachers and students in planning and data chats. 2. Attend AVID summer institute/complete the self assessment. Provide PD specifically in CRT/AVID strategies embedded in all content area trainings. Utilize district resources to embed equity conversations into collaborative planning, content area trainings and leadership team discussions. Utilize the School Leadership Team to monitor data across various subgroups. Work with University of Central Florida in partnership to support knowledge of ELL teachers and general education teachers to support unique academic language needs of students. Utilize strategies including gaming, gestures, visualizing, writing across content areas and collaborative structures. Support inclusive teaching model for ESE/ELL students across grade levels through clustering and attention to scheduling. Provide PD on SEL curriculum and develop understanding of the importance of morning meetings and problem solving around social issues as a daily part of day. Monitor through walk throughs, lesson plan and data review. 3. Deepen teacher understanding of the standards through study of the Depth of Knowledge (DOK) levels, test specs and shifts of instruction in planning and content area PD. Consider the aspects of rigor and use of the Text Dependent Questions when planning and build opportunities for students to prove thinking, debate and engage in error analysis. Utilize Marzano High Yield, AVID and CRT strategies to structure students cooperatively with the overall purpose of deepening knowledge. Plan for higher order thinking questions in advance, using the DOK to build them from low level to higher level. Teachers complete tasks in advance and utilize potential misconceptions as a springboard for lessons. Utilize coaching cycles to build teacher skill in questioning, monitoring for learning and overall facilitation. Monitor through STOIC and Marzano w/t, Instructional Leadership

team (ILT) meetings and learning walks. Reinforce through partnership with USF/PSRTI monthly leadership walks.

4. Provide PBIS training to ALL staff during preschool. Have team-developed plan ready to distribute. Teachers complete rules/consequence hierarchy as well as plans to teach processes/ rules collaboratively. Include signage of Guidelines For Success (GFS) and common area expectations throughout the school/classrooms. Teach common area behaviors. Incorporate school store as a daily reward. Implement/reinforce major/minor infractions. Behavior specialist/para create a schedule and walk through classrooms throughout the day to support students and teachers. Utilize MTSS team to determine students needing additional Tier 2/3 supports. Train students on GFS/ schoolwide processes. Monitor through Tier 1 w/t, STOIC, referrals, Office calls.

5. Family engagement team to develop event calendar linked to learning. Participate in coaching through Scholastic and Office of Strategic Partnerships. Utilize parent survey to monitor.

Person Responsible	Tracie Bergman (bergmant@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)

Wellness Goal-Ponce de Leon maintained a score of Bronze last year on our Healthy Schools Assessment. The goal for this year will be continue to maintain this score, and work towards moving to Silver. We will do this by improving our Physical Education (PE) program, aligning it more to standards and teaching not just various games, but health and wellness. We will continue to promote various healthy school initiatives such as Mindful Mondays, Meditation and breathing techniques, walking challenges, blood donations, and wellness screenings. We will ensure that students are eating healthy snacks provided through the school cafeteria and limit the amount of food items used as rewards/celebrations. Recess will be implemented daily and students will learn healthy habits through MORE health and PE lessons. Monitor through Healthy school rubric.

Bridging The Gap Goal- Ponce de Leon improved the performance of African American students this year so that we met the Federal Points Index in this subgroup, as well as all subgroups. However, the goal is to continue to improve this subgroup's performance in all areas so that they meet the 55% proficiency and gain measure and also so that there is not a gap between their performance and that of white students. The index this year was 44 when compared to 51 for our white students. One strategy to do this is by utilizing our newly formed Achievement GAP committee as part of our leadership team to monitor all MAP, IStation, Dreambox, Interim Assessment, and discipline data. Ensure all Black students scoring a Level 1 or 2 on the FSA in any area are provided a point person on the MTSS team who will meet with the student each grading period to review data and set goals. IN addition, our focus on Culturally Responsive teaching/Advancement Via Individual Determination (CRT/AVID) strategies, equity conversations and Social Emotional Learning (SEL) will also support this subgroup. Another goal is to use the talented program as a way to challenge and motivate our Black students and to challenge/enrich learning in the areas of math and science to push learning forward. Use data and walk through info to monitor.

Attendance-Improve the attendance rate to the expected level of 95% by decreasing the

number of students at 10% and 20% of the school days absent. Utilize the school of hope social worker to monitor attendance, reach out to families, conduct home visits and hold conferences with parents and students showing attendance concerns. Develop a school wide attendance process that involves rewarding classes, individual students and families when attendance improves. Utilize attendance contracts and small group circle conversations to support the attendance initiatives. Improve teacher/parent contact to be systematic and use the Child Study Team (CST) to ensure all Pending reason's are adjusted in focus, notes are documented and parent communication consistent. Monitor via the CST team through school profiles data, focus attendance coding report, and overall school attendance data.

Discipline Data-This year we decreased our Office Discipline Referrals to 6 referrals. We will continue to work on this area through our Schoolwide Behavior Plan/Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (SWBP/PBIS) strategy under our are of focus to ensure there are no discipline disparities call outs to the office are at a minimum.

School Leadership Team (SLT)/Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) -Create a school based leadership team wrapped upon various areas of the school performance to deepen teacher understanding of content, support cross grade level articulation, analyze school wide data and improve family involvement. Utilize the Instructional leadership team (ILT) (administration, coaches, guidance and behavior specialist) as leaders of each of these small teacher-based team to grow their capacity. Train the ILT in instructional leadership walks with a specific focus on 2nd and 4th grade through a partnership with University of South Florida/Problem Solving Response To Intervention. Use the Leadership Levers provided by Achievement Network to help measure, grow and monitor the ILT progress.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: culture and climate centered around creating high expectations for both teaching and learning				$244,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			3461 - Ponce De Leon Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$240,000.00
			Notes: Monies will be allocated towards Contracted Service binders for teaches to work on planning for instruction and writing formative assessments, Substitutes will also be provided 3x per year for teachers in grades 2-5 to work closely with the ELA coach to work on long term unit planning using the backwards design model. Instructional materials such as class sets of text, leveled readers and AVID supplies will be purchased to support students. Family engagement funds will be used to support learning events at the school through materials, food and supplies. Title one Hourlies to be purchased to support struggling readers to close the achievement gap early on and a paraprofessional to be purchased to support Positive behavior supports. Finally, a half of an ESE teacher will be purchased to help close that achievement gap as well. Professional development will also be paid for the instructional leadership team and administration to receive training in supporting standards based work with teachers, engaging in school turn around, and gain deeper understanding of content area.			
			3461 - Ponce De Leon Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$4,000.00
			Notes: Teachers will be paid to work after school to receive professional development on AVID strategies, Culturally responsive teaching, high yield Marzano strategies and the shifts of instruction. They will also have time to plan after school as a team.			

	Total:	$244,000.00