

Pinellas County Schools

Sawgrass Lake 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	20

Sawgrass Lake Elementary School

1815 77TH AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33702

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

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Clements

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2016

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 Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: B 2016-17: B 2015-16: C 2014-15: C 2013-14: C
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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 Sawgrass Lake Elementary is to educate, nurture, and inspire our students and staff to attain their goals each year to become lifelong learners, prepared for tomorrow's world

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
Clements, Jessica	Principal
Principal	
Briske, Melissa	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Acklin, Erika	Instructional Technology
Instructional Technology	
Cooper, Karris	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Hathaway , Catherine	Other
Other	
Leech, Melissa	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
Lightfoot, Amy	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Maxon, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
McCormick, Chris	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Proctor, Phyteria	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Shane, William	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	63	107	87	105	98	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	0	23	17	14	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	6	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	32	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	3	7	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

37

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/22/2019

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	33	20	18	26	27	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	6	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	37	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	1	0	11	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	49%	54%	57%	50%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	59%	58%	50%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	54%	53%	46%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	60%	61%	63%	65%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	73%	61%	62%	68%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	48%	51%	46%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	39%	53%	53%	66%	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	63 (0)	107 (0)	87 (0)	105 (0)	98 (0)	90 (0)	550 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	23 ()	17 ()	14 ()	11 ()	16 ()	81 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	13 (0)	26 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)	32 (0)	24 (0)	64 (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	50%	56%	-6%	58%	-8%
	2018	46%	53%	-7%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	56%	2%	58%	0%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
	2018	55%	50%	5%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%
	2018	58%	62%	-4%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	64%	10%	64%	10%
	2018	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	63%	60%	3%	60%	3%
	2018	65%	61%	4%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	54%	-15%	53%	-14%
	2018	63%	57%	6%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
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	21	34	31	35	57	44	14				
ELL	43	56	42	60	73	40	32				
BLK	28	54	70	44	63	36	18				
HSP	52	64	45	55	74	45	44				
MUL	71	91		82	100						
WHT	53	59	35	65	72	47	43				
FRL	42	58	50	55	67	39	30				

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	29	42	40	34	46	35					
ELL	38	54	50	65	69						
ASN	77			85							
BLK	32	41	35	52	55	39	48				
HSP	44	50	38	61	61		50				
MUL	74	45		100	73						
WHT	53	50	56	66	73	50	73				
FRL	45	47	44	60	63	47	63				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	429
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
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	57
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	86
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	53
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	49
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

Science showed the lowest performance, 39% vs. 66% the prior year. Contributing factors include lack of effective planning for 10-70-20 science instructional model and a decrease in science PD throughout the year.

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

Science showed the greatest decline, 39% vs. 66% the prior year. Contributing factors include lack of effective planning for 10-70-20 science instructional model and a decrease in science PD throughout the year.

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

The component that demonstrated the greatest gap was science. The factors that contributed to this gap include a lack of professional development throughout the school year and a lack of effective planning and monitoring.

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

ELA learning gains demonstrated the most improvement with 61% making gains. This is an 11 point increase compared to the previous year. Our school actions included: utilizing the bi-weekly assessments to drive instruction and data reflection in PLC's.

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

An area of concern for the EWS section is the number of students that scored a level 1 on ELA or Math. There is a total of 64 students.

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

1. Increase science proficiency; ensure effective science planning takes place
2. Continue to focus on L25 students and increase proficiency in both ELA and Math

- 3. Improve subgroup proficiency for ELL, ESE, and African American students
- 4. Increase collaborative planning for teams with guided data reflection questions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Proficiency Our current level of performance is 49%, as evidenced on FSA ELA assessment.
Rationale	We expect our performance level to be at 60% by May 2020. The problem is occurring because students need to be engaged in complex tasks, teachers need to strengthen the core and increase engagement and accountability.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 49 % to 60 %, as measured by FSA ELA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Clements (clements@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Empower ELA champions/cohort teachers to develop as literacy leaders to provide PD and support goals. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and analyze data in PLCs to inform instruction in whole group, small group, as well as one-to-one instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To improve our current level of performance on FSA ELA assessment by May 2020.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ELA champions will provide ongoing PD and feedback to teachers during PLC's and staff curriculum meetings on a monthly basis. 2. Analyze data in PLC's to inform instruction on a weekly basis 3. Monitor and support implementation of instruction during weekly observations by using monitoring tools and providing specific feedback 4. Administrators will provide support to teachers in reflecting on a lesson and developing a plan of action for remediation and enrichment. 5. Differentiate instruction in the core to meet the needs of learners. Incorporate can-do descriptors for ELL students to differentiate instruction. 6. Engage students in complex tasks and text 7. Build stamina 8. Incorporate the organizational strategies of AVID- note taking
Person Responsible	Jessica Clements (clements@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 60% as evidenced on FSA Math assesment We expect our performance level to be 65% by May 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving math proficiency will increase from 60% to 65% as measured by FSA Math assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Phyteria Proctor (gomillionp@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure feedback, professional development, and PLCs align with the Key Shifts in Mathematics Focus, Coherence, Rigor and promote strong alignment between standard, target, and task.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To improve our current level of performance on Math FSA by May 2020.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention, and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance. 2. Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning 3. Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth 4. Teachers will intentionally plan for cognitively complex tasks. 5. All teachers will be trained in new math adoption and will collaboratively plan instruction in PLC's 6. Develop formative assessments to measure student success on standards 7. Daily Number routines, warm up review
Person Responsible	Phyteria Proctor (gomillionp@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science Proficiency
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 39% proficient as evidenced in Science NGSSS. We expect our performance level to be 60% by May 2020.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 39% to 60%, as measured by NGSSS.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Phyteria Proctor (gomillionp@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To improve our current performance on Science NGSSS by May 2020. After review of the data, we have determined that a greater focus is needed on 3rd and 4th grade standards. There is a need for a more structured review and monitoring plan based on previous diagnostic data, with a focus on low performing standards.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop, implement and monitor a data-driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th Grade Diagnostic Assessment. 4th and 5th-grade students will utilize the unit assessments. Low performing standards will be identified in the unit assessment piece data. Low performing standards will be embedded in the review plan. 2. Facilitate science professional development through monthly curriculum meetings and weekly PLCs 3. Utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model (10% setting the purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) and include appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignment to the 1st - 5th grade standards. 4. Monitor for consistent effective instruction that promotes student-centered with rigor for all science labs grades 1-5 5. Support and utilize formal and informal assessment strategies that inform instruction. Identify proficiency levels and implement instructional strategies to increase the conceptual development of key content
Person Responsible	Phyteria Proctor (gomillionp@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	School Climate
Rationale	We currently have 80% of our student meeting or exceeding behavior expectations as measured by the % of discipline referrals/incidents.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students meeting school-wide behavior expectations will increase from 80% to 90% as measured by the end of the year discipline referral data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chris McCormick (mccormickch@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the implementation of research-based practices that communicate high expectations for each student. Support the development and implementation of school-wide ownership of equitable practices that engage students in acknowledging and adhering to processes and procedures.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To improve positive behavior outcomes for all students
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor and support staff for implementation and fidelity of restorative/ equitable practices 2. Review behavior data trends with staff monthly; celebrate areas of growth and update strategies for improvement. 3. Review and revise the school-wide plan for restorative practices. 4. Implement a reflection station to align with RP in the cafeteria.
Person Responsible	Chris McCormick (mccormickch@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Our attendance rate is 94%. Currently, 23% of our student have missed 10% or more of school
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We look to decrease the percentage of students missing 10% or more to 10%. Improve the attendance rate for our students to increase student success. Currently, 23% of our students have missed 10% or more of school. We look to decrease from 23% to 10% as measured by the student data recorded in the school profile.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melissa Leech (leechm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all tiers on a monthly basis. Strengthen the implementation of tier 3 interventions to address and support the needs of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To improve our attendance rate to increase the academic success of our students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop and implement attendance incentive programs and competitions. 2. Engage families in attendance related activities to ensure they are knowledgeable of the data and aware of the importance of attendance. 3. Review data and effectiveness of school-wide attendance strategies on a monthly basis. 4. Monitor and ensure attendance is taken accurately and recorded on a daily basis and reflects appropriate entry codes.
Person Responsible	Melissa Leech (leechm@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Healthy School
Rationale	Our current level of performance is eligible for bronze, as evidenced in the Alliance for Healthier Generation, Healthy Schools Framework.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our school will continue to work toward becoming eligible for bronze status by improving our health practices in the Physical Activity topic as measured by the Alliance for a Healthier Generations online assessment tool by the end of the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chris McCormick (mccormickch@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	To continue to work towards becoming eligible for bronze status by improving our health practices as measured by the Alliance for a Healthier Generations online assessment tool by the end of the school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To increase our opportunity for national recognition and improve our health practices.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete Healthy Start assessment 2. Develop and implement a Healthy Schools Program Action Plan. 3. Assemble a committed Healthy School team for routine review of action plan and progress. 4. Apply for the recognition for bronze status.
Person Responsible	Chris McCormick (mccormickch@pcsb.org)

#7	
Title	Bridging the Gap
Rationale	Our current level of performance according to the FSA assessment is 28% proficient in ELA and 44% proficient in math
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>The percent of black students achieving proficiency will increase from 28% in ELA to 60 % as measured by the FSA assessment.</p> <p>The percent of black students achieving proficiency will increase from 44% in Math to 65 %, as measured by the FSA assessment.</p> <p>Learning gains expectation is 100%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Phyteria Proctor (gomillionp@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers on CRT strategies to increase engagement.</p> <p>Ensure black students are participating in extended learning opportunities before and after school.</p> <p>Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To increase the percentage of black students achieving proficiency in ELA and Math and ensure 100% learning gains.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide targeted professional development and additional coaching to teachers on CRT strategies to increase engagement in rigorous instruction and increase the percent of proficient students. 2. Implement CRT instructional practices with fidelity. 3. Monitor fidelity of CRT instructional practices.
Person Responsible	Phyteria Proctor (gomillionp@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	ESE
Rationale	Our current level of performance is 21% proficient in ELA and 35% proficient in Math, as evidenced on FSA assessment.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>The percent of ESE students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 21% to 60%, as measured by FSA ELA.</p> <p>The percent of ESE students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 35% to 65%, as measured by FSA Math.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Clements (clements@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students requiring ESE services work toward mastery of meaningful IEP goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content in the Least Restrictive Environment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To increase the proficiency of our ESE students in ELA and Math utilizing standards-based curriculum and engage in rigorous tasks.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor all student through data chats 2. Increase communication between ESE and Gen Ed teachers regarding goals and daily instruction 3. Implement CRT practices 4. Meet with the leadership team to discuss the test accommodation schedule 5. To collaborate ESE teams with gen ed teams for PLC.
Person Responsible	Jessica Clements (clements@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	Family and Community Engagement To increase the percentage of parents engaged in school-related activities.
Rationale	We currently have 40% of our families attending school functions and collaborating with school staff as measured by parent sign-ins.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase family and community engagement from 40% to 75%, as measured by parent attendance/ sign in.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Clements (clements@pcsb.org) Communicate with families about their students progress and school processes.
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide academic tools to families to support student achievement at home. Build positive relationships with families and community partners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To increase the percentage of parents engaged in the education of their children.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize social media to increase communication with parents Provide academic workshops for parents to support students at home; provide academic tools and resources Utilize student services to provide families with community support Increase positive interaction with parents on a regular basis; gain parent feedback
Person Responsible	Jessica Clements (clements@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 Proficiency				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			3751 - Sawgrass Lake Elementary Schl	School Improvement Funds		\$3,000.00

		<i>Notes: TDE for all teachers Gr. K-5, for data analysis and instructional planning (Administrator led). This TDE will allow teachers to analyze data for ELA, Math, and Science and develop goals and action plans.</i>	
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency	\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Science Proficiency	\$0.00
4	III.A	Areas of Focus: School Climate	\$0.00
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: Attendance	\$0.00
6	III.A	Areas of Focus: Healthy School	\$0.00
7	III.A	Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap	\$0.00
8	III.A	Areas of Focus: ESE	\$0.00
9	III.A	Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$3,000.00