

Pinellas County Schools

Safety Harbor Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Safety Harbor Elementary School

535 5TH AVE N, Safety Harbor, FL 34695

<http://www.planetshes.com>

Demographics

Principal: Cecilia Palmer

Start Date for this Principal: 6/13/2013

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)	44%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: B 2014-15: B 2013-14: B
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

The mission of Safety Harbor Elementary School is to educate and prepare each student for college, career and life.

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
Palmer, Cecilia	Principal
Principal	
Stryker, Wendy	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Yowler, Emily	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
Happel, Susan	Other
Other	
Durden, Emilie	Attendance/Social Work
Attendance/Social Work	
McKnight, Erica	Psychologist
Psychologist	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	86	107	118	101	93	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	585
Attendance below 90 percent	2	7	13	6	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	6	4	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	18	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	1	1	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

45

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/20/2019

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	11	21	6	15	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	7	3	1	5	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	1	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	63%	54%	57%	62%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	59%	58%	54%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	54%	53%	48%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	72%	61%	63%	75%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	74%	61%	62%	77%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	48%	51%	51%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	68%	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	86 (0)	107 (0)	118 (0)	101 (0)	93 (0)	80 (0)	585 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 ()	7 ()	13 ()	6 ()	11 ()	5 ()	44 (0)
One or more suspensions	6 ()	4 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	18 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	18 (0)	13 (0)	34 (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	59%	56%	3%	58%	1%
	2018	54%	53%	1%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	56%	8%	58%	6%
	2018	65%	51%	14%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
	2018	65%	50%	15%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
	2018	64%	62%	2%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	64%	15%	64%	15%
	2018	75%	62%	13%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
05	2019	75%	60%	15%	60%	15%
	2018	80%	61%	19%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	27	64	74	36	48	31	47				
ELL	25	60	55	58	80	73					

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
BLK	28	50	40	40	69		40				
HSP	33	65	60	54	68	50	42				
MUL	61	82		94	82						
WHT	73	72	67	77	76	33	76				
FRL	42	57	60	55	65	47	49				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	22	36	46	43	62	55	30				
ELL	9	46		35	46						
BLK	39	44		57	69	60					
HSP	44	62	46	51	62	18	58				
MUL	61	62		67	54						
WHT	68	52	54	82	83	63	81				
FRL	46	48	37	58	71	43	64				

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	67
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	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	532
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	61

English Language Learners	
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	45
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	56
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	68
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	57
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

One data component showing the lowest performance was ELA (English/Language Arts) with 62% of our 3rd-5th grade students achieving a level 3 or above. After analyzing ELA strands tested, the lowest performing strands were related to "Key Ideas and Details" and "Integration of Knowledge and Ideas" show the lowest performance by students. Contributing factors may include student's level of vocabulary acquisition and/or background knowledge of the text topic.

Another data component showing low performance were students in the bottom quartile in math with only 45% showing gains.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019 were students in the bottom quartile for math. The percentage of students making gains in 2018 was 51% and the percentage making gains in 2019 was 45%. A decrease of 6 percentage points.

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

All content cells are above the district and state average. Those that have the greatest gap (positive) are 4th and 5th grade Math. The grade level with the lowest gap is 3rd grade ELA at 59% only one percentage point above the state and 3 above the district.

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

ELA Learning Gains for our L25 showed the greatest gain from 54% to 70%. The actions we took to address this area was increased inclusion of VE and EL support within the general education classroom. Increased exposure to grade level complex text and purposeful student data chats between VE and general education classroom teachers.

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

Although we have lowered the number of students who have earned a Level 1 based on FSA, there is still room for improvement. In 2018 we had 53 students and in 2019 we had 34 students. That is a reduction of 19 students.

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

1. Increase ELA performance for our students grades K-5 by increasing school-wide focus on aligning the level of rigor to standard-based instruction, as it relates to instructional delivery, tasks and assessments.
2. Increase Math performance for our students grades K-5 increasing school-wide focus on aligning the level of rigor to standard-based instruction, as it relates to instructional delivery, tasks and assessments.
3. Increase school-wide focus on high-level strategies that moves the classroom learning environment from teacher-centered to student-centered with rigor.
4. Increase the implementation of culturally responsive instructional strategies with a focus on the 6M's – Meaning, Modeling, Monitoring, Mouth, Movement and Music.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA - Expectations for standards based planning and instructional delivery Our current level of performance for ELA is 63% based on FSA (Florida Standards Assessment) for students in grades 3-5.
Rationale	We expect our performance to be 73% by May of 2020, based on FSA (Florida Standards Assessment) ELA for students in grades 3-5.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students proficient will increase from 63% to 73%, as measured by the 2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Empower ELA champions and teacher leaders to become leaders in literacy instruction by sharing best practices through co-teaching, opening classrooms for observation, debrief and feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In an effort to improve instructional practice, classroom teachers need to observe peers and best practices in action, practice these strategies and receive feedback in order to make informed decisions about instruction. Pockets of consistent positive student performance are demonstrated in core and within learning gains. In order to implement best practices campus wide, teachers need a continued opportunity to share ideas and demonstrate effective teaching.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify ELA Champions and Teacher Leaders in Literacy in each grade level. 2. ELA Champions will attend district professional development to gain information for each grade level. 3. Information will be shared through planned PLC's. 4. Develop a format for identifying a focus through planning and debriefing co-teaching / observations. 5. Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation (EL and VE resource), intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance. Lessons should be focused on student centered vs. teacher centered. Design lessons on a scaffolded trajectory. 6. A structure / note taking tool for co-teaching and/or observation will be introduced to each grade level team. 7. Targeted actionable feedback will be provided during walkthroughs based on our action steps.
Person Responsible	Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Math - Expectations for standards based planning and instructional delivery
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 73%, as evidenced in FSA Math Proficiency. We expect our performance level to be 83% by May, 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on MTLI (Math Teacher Leadership Institute) practices and teacher leaders in mathematics sharing best practices related to engagement of students in complex tasks and utilizing higher order questioning to help elaborate on content across grades levels we will increase our Math performance from 73% to 83% as reflected on our FSA Math performance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Empower MTLI (Math Teacher Leaders Institute) members and teacher leaders to become leaders in mathematics instruction by sharing best practices through co-teaching, opening classrooms for observation, debrief and feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In an effort to improve instructional practice, classroom teachers need to observe peers and best practices in action, practice these strategies and receive feedback in order to make informed decisions about instruction. Pockets of consistent positive student performance are demonstrated overall core and within learning gains. In order to implement best practices campus wide, teachers need an opportunity to share ideas and demonstrate effective teaching.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify MTLI Members and Teacher Leaders in Mathematics in each grade level. 2. MTLI Members will attend district professional development to gain information for primary and intermediate levels with a focus on new curriculum. 3. Information sharing and collaborative planning will occur through planned PLC's. 4. Develop a format for identifying a focus through planning and debriefing co-teaching / observations. 5. Use data to plan instruction (MAP, Unit Assessments, Exit Tickets) that ensures differentiation (EL and VE resource), intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance. Lessons should be focused on student centered vs. teacher centered. Design lessons on a scaffolded trajectory. 6. A structure / note taking tool for co-teaching and/or observation will be introduced to each grade level team. 7. Targeted actionable feedback will be provided during walkthroughs based on our action steps.
Person Responsible	Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science - Expectations for 10-70-20 implementation and science vocabulary across grade levels
Rationale	<p>Our current level of performance is 69%, as evidenced in NGSSS (Next Generation Sunshine State Standards) Assessment proficiency in grade 5. We expect our performance level to be 82% by May, 2020.</p> <p>Results of Science trend data based on NGSSS (Next Generation Sunshine State Standards Assessment)</p> <p>69% 2019 72% 2018 66% 2017</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 69% to 82%, as measured by NGSSS (Next Generation Sunshine State Standards) Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	By focusing on increasing the use of science vocabulary through gaming reviews across grade levels, we will increase our Science performance on the NGSSS from 69% to 82% as reflected on our SSA Science performance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The problem/gap is occurring because of an identified need of staff to increase engagement of students in complex tasks and reinforce the use of the 10-70-20 (10% setting the purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) instructional model. If implementation of the above engagement strategies would occur, the problem would be reduced by 10%.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify teacher leaders in Science in addition to our school learning specialist. 2. Information sharing and collaborative planning will occur through planned PLC's. 4. Through collaborative planning during PLC's, develop a focus for instruction and debriefing co-teaching / observations with a using the 10-70-20 (10% setting the purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) model including both core and science lab. 5. Use diagnostic and unit assessments along with formative assessment data to identify low performing standards and embed low proficient standards into a review plan. Plans for instruction will ensure differentiation, intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance. Design lessons on a scaffolded trajectory. 6. A structure / note taking tool for co-teaching and/or observation will be introduced to each grade level team.
Person Responsible	Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Bridging the Gap Goal
Rationale	Our current level of performance for Black/African American students in grades 3-5 is 28% in ELA, 40% in Math, and 40% in Science as evidenced in FSA ELA and Math and the NGSSS Assessment in Science. We expect our performance level to be 73% in ELA, 83% in Math, and 82% in Science by May 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of Black/African American students achieving proficiency will increase from 28% in ELA, 40% in Math, and 40% in Science to 73% in ELA, 83% in Math, and 82% in Science as measured by FSA ELA and Math/NGSSS Assessment in Science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on culturally relevant strategies to increase engagement and improve pass rates. *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. *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 school-wide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>The problem/gap is occurring because of the need for increased professional development of culturally relevant instructional practices and continual progression toward culturally relevant teaching.</p> <p>If culturally relevant teaching would occur, the problem would be reduced by 45% in ELA, 43% in Math and 42% in Science.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will participate and implement strategies from Restorative Practice, Equity and CRT professional development. This will be provided throughout the year. 2. Our black students will be academically monitored through our biweekly MTSS meetings. Interventions will be made based on current data through MAP, classroom and running records. 3. Invitations to our extended learning / enrichment program will be sent to all of our black students to provide remediation or enrichment. Personal phone calls will be made by administration if no response is received. 4. Students who are not meeting projected proficiency will be paired with a mentor.
Person Responsible	Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	School Climate / Conditions for Learning - Implement Daily Restorative Circles/Class Meetings
Rationale	Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is a referral risk per student of 4.3%. This is an increase of 2.2%. The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because of possible gaps in behavior management strategies/interventions for ESE students. 8 of 10 students receiving 2-5 referrals issued were ESE students. We demonstrated an increase of behavior referrals from 37 in 2017-2018 for 14 students to 58 referrals for 29 students in 2018-2019. Five of 5 out of school suspensions and 7 of 13 In School Suspensions were ESE students.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By reducing the number of behavior referrals by 50%, from 58 referrals to 29, students will be better prepared to focus on academic learning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence based strategies we will implement include growing our group of equity champions, continued implementation of Restorative Practices, PBIS, Culturally Relevant Teaching with a focus on SEL (Social Emotional Learning).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If on-going implementation of Restorative Practices, SEL and Culturally Relevant Teaching practices occur, school-wide behaviors will reduce. We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation of our strategies by weekly SBLT meetings, monthly staff meetings and weekly grade level team meetings.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pre-School: As a school team, staff members will revisit core values that our school culture is based on and implement Pre-School Equity training (3hr). 2. Actively display, (re)teach and implement school-wide Tier 1 practices and strategies through class meetings/restorative circles. 3. Professional Development in the area of Mental Health Training, Restorative Practices and Culturally Relevant Teaching strategies. 4. Book study applicable to all classroom settings (general education and ESE) 5. Proactively address students with identified behavior concerns and differentiating support will be provided to students who are in need (small groups/lunch bunch/mentors). 5. Ambassador program will continue to provide new students to Safety Harbor Elementary with a tour, introduction and connection to a peer upon their arrival. 6. School Counselor lessons will take place monthly based on grade level areas of need and guidance standards.
Person Responsible	Susan Happel (happels@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Our current attendance rate for all students is 95.6% with 18 students absent 20% or more of the school year and 72 students absent 10% or more of the school year. We expect our performance level to be 97.6% by May, 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students missing 10% or more of school will decrease from 11% of all students to 8% of all students, as measured by CST (Child Study Team) monthly reports.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students. Strengthen the attendance problem-solving and tracking process to address and support the needs of students across all Tiers on an ongoing basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If continued education for families regarding the importance of attending school and providing incentives for improved attendance) would occur, the problem would be reduced by 3%. We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation of our strategies by monitoring attendance levels during SBLT and follow-up with applicable staff as to students' attendance status and parent communication methods as necessary
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be proactive by sharing a list of students with historical patterns of non-attendance with their newly assigned teachers so they can begin building relationships with those students/families immediately upon the start of the school year. 2. Conduct training in the pre-school planning days regarding 'how to' change attendance codes in FOCUS in order to minimize reasons unknown (pending) codes as well as 'how to' record contact with families in the parent contact log on FOCUS. 3. Implement new interventions to assist with attempts to strengthen communication between school and families, such as utilizing attendance stickers in the daily binders, pre-constructed emails, etc.
Person Responsible	Emilie Durden (durdene@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Family & Community Engagement
Rationale	Based on our 2018-2019 Family-School Partnership self assessment we have completed 14 of 16 items. The two that are in need of improvement are to create a family-school partnership action team and building home libraries.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By April of 2020 we will score a 16 out of 16 on the Family-School Partnership Self Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Effectively communicate with families about their students' progress and school processes/practices. Provide academic tools to families in support of their students' achievement at home. Purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to advocate for their students. Intentionally build positive relationships with families and community partners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Communication and parent partnership centered around the student gives parents an understanding of their child's strengths and weaknesses. Books at home have a positive impact on literacy and create a culture of reading learning in the home.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a family school partnership action team, including but not limited to our Family-Community Liaison, an Administrator, Parent and classroom teacher. 2. Provide a variety of formats in regard to communication – agenda books, portal, newsletter, Principal call-outs, parent/teacher conferences, Meet and Greet, Open House, event nights, current and relevant on-line resources. 3. Organize and facilitate Family Content Area Nights (Reading, Math, Science) in conjunction with PTA. 4. Parent/Teacher Conferences with each family with a deadline goal of November. 5. Utilize Family and Community Liaison to engage community stakeholders in site-based initiatives. 6. Build a "Birthday Book" program in an effort to build home libraries.
Person Responsible	Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	Our current level of performance is Silver, as evidenced in Alliance for a Healthier Generation. Anticipated barriers toward reaching Gold in the 2019-2020 school year could potentially be stakeholder buy-in to expectations and guidelines.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By maintaining our strategies in this area of focus and without an barriers anticipated we expect our performance level to be Silver by April, 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Wendy Stryker (strykerw@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies as it relates to personal health.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Schools can play an important role in both promoting healthy eating habits to children, and ensuring school food provides healthy balanced and nutritious meals with the appropriate amount of energy and nutrients pupils need.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assemble a Healthy School Team made up of a minimum of four (4) individuals including, but not limited to: PE Teacher, Cafe Manager, Wellness Champion, Administrator, and Parent. 2. Attend district-supported professional development Healthy School Team August 2019- April 2020. 3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment Healthy School Team August 2019 - September 2020. 4. Develop and Implement Healthy School Program Action Plan Healthy School Team October 2019 - April 2020. 5. Update Healthy Schools Program Assessment and Apply for Gold Recognition (if applicable).
Person Responsible	Wendy Stryker (strykerw@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	Gifted
Rationale	We need to increase our staff awareness of differentiating for our gifted student population.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to have 75% of our instructional staff members participate and implement strategies in their instruction for enrichment of our gifted students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers earning gifted micro credentialing will plan intentional differentiation for gifted learners. Teachers will use ELA Module extension for above grade level learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our rationale for implementing these strategies will challenge, enrich and increase FSA/SSA scores to levels 4 and 5's.
Action Step	
Description	1. Staff members will participate in Gifted Micro-credentialing. 2. Teachers will include project based learning in their planning for enrichment.
Person Responsible	Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@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 - Expectations for standards based planning and instructional delivery				\$3,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		140-Substitute Teachers	3731 - Safety Harbor Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: TDE's for all professional development.</i>			
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Math - Expectations for standards based planning and instructional delivery				\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Science - Expectations for 10-70-20 implementation and science vocabulary across grade levels				\$0.00
4	III.A	Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap Goal				\$0.00
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: School Climate / Conditions for Learning - Implement Daily Restorative Circles/Class Meetings				\$0.00

6	III.A	Areas of Focus: Attendance	\$0.00
7	III.A	Areas of Focus: Family & Community Engagement	\$0.00
8	III.A	Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools	\$0.00
9	III.A	Areas of Focus: Gifted	\$0.00
Total:			\$3,500.00