

Pinellas County Schools

Seminole 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	6
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Seminole Elementary School

10950 74TH AVE N, Seminole, FL 33772

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

Demographics

Principal: Nanette Grasso H

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2019

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)	64%
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: B
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 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 Seminole Elementary is to develop a community of learners, provide a safe environment, and promote opportunities for the highest academic and personal achievement by fostering the values of respect, responsibility, honesty and self motivation.

Provide the school's vision statement

Unite with the parents and the community to ensure 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
Carey, Cathy	Administrative Support
Administrative Support	
Grimm, Vicki	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	39	71	80	82	64	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	439
Attendance below 90 percent	0	5	13	10	7	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	0	4	4	12	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	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

40

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	12	18	14	18	24	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	26	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	2	0	0	6	11	10	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	57%	54%	57%	52%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	59%	58%	42%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	54%	53%	40%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	63%	61%	63%	66%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	62%	61%	62%	49%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	48%	51%	31%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	60%	53%	53%	53%	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	39 (0)	71 (0)	80 (0)	82 (0)	64 (0)	103 (0)	439 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	5 ()	13 ()	10 ()	7 ()	20 ()	55 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)	9 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	14 (0)	26 (0)	46 (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	52%	56%	-4%	58%	-6%
	2018	59%	53%	6%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	56%	7%	58%	5%
	2018	54%	51%	3%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
	2018	38%	50%	-12%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	62%	1%	62%	1%
	2018	64%	62%	2%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	64%	0%	64%	0%
	2018	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	57%	60%	-3%	60%	-3%
	2018	61%	61%	0%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	60%	54%	6%	53%	7%
	2018	50%	57%	-7%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	39	54	45	39	64	61	32				
ELL	30			50							
BLK	23	33		44	73						
HSP	50	48		52	56		50				
MUL	58	74		72	65						
WHT	63	66	53	65	60	48	62				
FRL	49	57	58	54	57	51	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	25	36	42	30	26	12	19				
ELL	31	36		54	45						
BLK	38	39		48	39						
HSP	53	56	45	60	40		55				
MUL	55	35		62	53		70				
WHT	53	41	39	69	49	41	50				

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
FRL	49	42	44	61	46	27	53				

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	62
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	90
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	57
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	43
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	51
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	67
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	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

ELA Achievement Level at 57% and the Learning Gains for L25 students in ELA and Math are at 53% and 51%

The biggest drop in ELA was in grade 3. This was a result of the students entering the grade level significantly lower than the previous years group.

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

The Math Achievement Level declined by 3% points from the previous year and dropped at each grade level. I attribute the decline to the transitions and lack of stability in the teaching staff at the grade level.

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

Grades 3 and 5 ELA Achievement level showed the greatest gap compared to the state average.

I attribute the decline to the transitions and lack of stability in the teaching staff at the grade level.

This was a result of the students entering the grade level significantly lower than the previous years group.

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

The component areas showing the greatest improvement was overall learning gains and the learning gains for L25 students.

This was achieved by carefully monitoring student progress as measured by MAP data, and formative assessments.

Students not making learning gains were targeted for additional interventions. Our L25 students were all invited to ELP throughout the month of May. Attendance and academic progress was monitored weekly.

Through regular walk-throughs we ensured that instruction was Standards- Based and students were academically engaged.

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

The two areas of concern are the percent of students scoring at Level 1 for grade 5 26, grade 4 14 and grade 3 6.

The other area of concern is attendance below 90%.

20 -grade 5

7 -grade 4

10 -grade 3

13-grade 2

5- grade 1

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

1. Standards- based instruction with rigor
2. Monitoring academic progress for improved student achievement
3. Tier II and Tier III Interventions provided with fidelity
4. School- wide reading incentives to promote independent reading. This was a result of the students entering the grade level significantly lower than the previous years group.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	ELA Standards based instruction with academic rigor
Rationale	<p>1. Our current achievement level of performance is 57%, as evidenced in 2018 FSA/ELA.</p> <p>2. We expect our performance level to be 67% by the end of the 2019-2020 school year.</p> <p>3. The proficiency level is the result of a lack of consistent academic rigor and standards-based instruction</p> <p>4. If student centered standard-based instruction with rigor would occur, we would increase our proficiency level by 10% or more.</p>

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

Increase the level of proficiency in ELA from 57% to 67% as measured by the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Vicki Grimm (grimmv@pcsb.org)

Facilitate ELA -focused, consistent and sustained professional development with a focus on standards-based instruction, target and task alignment

Collaborative Planning and inclusive scheduling as we pursue inclusion to the maximum extent.

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student during core and intervention.

Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex texts and tasks.

Evidence-based Strategy

Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.

Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussions and writing with feedback. Providing ample time for students to engage in grade level texts.

Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning

Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth

Utilization of MAP Continuum of Learning to support differentiated instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

These strategies were selected as teachers consistently focus on differentiation and improvement of instruction as an area of growth. Data from our ISM visits, classroom walk-throughs, and assessment data confirm that differentiation is a priority this school year.

Action Step

1. Formal and informal observations assessing instruction and using the data as feedback to drive the instruction and make adjustments and for teacher growth.
2. Utilize small group instruction at all levels such as Guided Reading to meet the needs of all students.
3. Design lessons by scaffolding the difficulty levels; using multiple check points, building upon each student's level.
4. PLC's on a bi-weekly basis including the discussion of student data and to aide in planning instruction.

Description

5. Intentional lesson planning aligning high levels of rigor according to Marzano's Taxonomy by adjusting instruction through the use of talk, task, text and student needs.
6. During grade-level PLCs, district-level literacy coach will provide professional development strategies with guided reading techniques and engaging students in cognitively complex tasks.
7. During PLCs, MAP data mining with Lauren Hansel with a focus on goal-setting and differentiating instruction for increased student achievement.
8. Utilization of Can Do descriptors & Module Performance indicators for English Language learners to differentiate lessons.

Person Responsible

Vicki Grimm (grimmv@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Science standards based instruction with academic rigor
Rationale	<p>1. Our current achievement level of performance is 60%, as evidenced in 2018 FSA/ELA.</p> <p>2. We expect our performance level to be 70% by the end of the 2019-2020 school year.</p> <p>3. The proficiency level is the result of a lack of consistent academic rigor and standards based instruction</p> <p>4. If student centered standard-based instruction with rigor would occur, we would increase our proficiency level by 10 % or more.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the level of proficiency in Science from 60% to 70% as measured by the FSA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Vicki Grimm (grimmv@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 rule(10% setting the purpose, 70% core science, 20 % confirming the learning) and utilize science labs in alignment with grade level standards</p> <p>Monitor for consistent effective instruction that promotes student centered learning with rigor during science labs.</p> <p>Implement and monitor science academic gaming based on data with a focus on the 60 power words.</p> <p>Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth.</p> <p>Utilization of MAP Continuum of Learning to support differentiated instruction.</p> <p>Biweekly progress monitoring for L 25 students to closely monitor and inform/adjust instruction.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The science proficiency rates have increased by 10% from the previous year and would like to continue and enhance the strategies that are currently being implemented along with a focus on rigorous instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<p>1. Regular formal and informal assessments at all levels – utilizing the data to drive the curriculum</p> <p>2. Data used to plan instruction infusing differentiation, interventions and enrichment and scaffolding to increase learning for each student</p> <p>3. Utilization of the Science Diagnostic Assessment and Assessment</p>

Plan

4. During PLCs, data mining Cycle Assessments & Unit Assessments
5. Academic Gaming based on the data

**Person
Responsible**

Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)

#3

Title	Math Standards based instruction with academic rigor
Rationale	<p>1. Our current achievement level of performance is 63%, as evidenced in 2018 FSA/Math</p> <p>2. We expect our performance level to be 73% by the end of the 2019-2020 school year.</p> <p>3. The proficiency level is the result of a lack of consistent academic rigor and standards based instruction</p> <p>4. If student centered standard-based instruction with rigor would occur, we would increase our proficiency level by 10 % or more.</p>

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

The percent of students achieving the proficiency level in Math Increase from 63% in Math to 73% as measured by the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Vicki Grimm (grimmv@pcsb.org)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.

Provide feedback both in and outside the Marzano framework to all mathematics teachers a minimum of once every 2 weeks.

Evidence-based Strategy

Ensure that rigorous student centered instruction occurs daily through the use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning and Number Routines. This work is supported through PLC's and curriculum meetings.

Use of multiple forms of assessment to inform instruction.

Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth

Utilization of MAP Continuum of Learning to support differentiated instruction

Biweekly progress monitoring for L 25 students to closely monitor and inform/adjust instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

These strategies were selected as teachers consistently focus on differentiation and improvement of instruction as an area of growth. Data from our ISM visits, classroom walk-throughs, and assessment data confirm that differentiation is a priority this school year.

Action Step

<p>Description</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formal and informal observations assessing instruction and using the data as feedback to drive the instruction and make adjustments and for teacher growth. 2. Design lessons by scaffolding the difficulty levels; using multiple check points, use of critical questions...building upon each student's level. 3. PLC's on a bi-weekly basis including the discussion of student data and to aide in planning instruction. 4. Intentional lesson planning...aligning high levels of rigor according to Marzano's Taxonomy. 5. Multiple opportunities for students to engage in cognitively tasks. 6. Teachers collaborate to collect and implement rigorous tasks aligned to each math standard (Mathematics Formative Assessment System - MFAS) and math tasks from the curriculum guide 7. Teachers use a variety of math tools and manipulatives as part of the instruction - hands on, high engagement (rulers, counters, number lines, pattern locks, manips...etc) and encourage students voice and choice in solving problems. 8. During grade level PLCs professional development will be provided for Ready Math and Dreambox. 9. During PLCs, MAP data mining with Lauren Hansel with a focus on goal-setting and differentiating instruction for increased student achievement.
<p>Person Responsible</p>	<p>Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)</p>

#4	
Title	Conditions For Learning
Rationale	<p>Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 23 referrals received by students during the 18-19 school year; our African American students representing 43% of the referrals written. We expect our performance level to be reduced by 50% and the number of African American students earning referrals to be reduced by 50% as well by the end of 2019-2020 school year.</p> <p>The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because lack of fidelity and inconsistent usage of the Restorative Practices by all staff members.</p> <p>If consistent use of Restorative Practices with all students would occur, the problem would be reduced by 50% or more, as evidenced by the number of referrals entered into focus and coded in School Profiles.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of black students receiving referrals will decrease from 43% to 21%, as measured by referrals written and as and the data available on the behavior dashboard
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Vicki Grimm (grimmv@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Strengthen the ability of all staff to fully implement Restorative Practices to ensure that positive relationships are established and maintained.</p> <p>Support the implementation engagement strategies that support the development of social and instructional teaching practices.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Support and development of school-wide ownership of equitable practices ensures an environment that engages students and learning.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restorative Practices Monthly Restorative Practice training. 2. CHAMPS Training For all staff on Site based P.D. days. 3. Update school-wide plan on a monthly basis. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Celebrate areas of growth • Update strategies for areas of improvement 4. Opportunities for students with referrals to meet with Behavior Specialist and Guidance Counselor.
Person Responsible	Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	Bridging The Gap- Black Student Achievement
Rationale	Our current level of performance show that their is a 40% gap in ELA proficiency and a 20% in Math proficiency as measured by the FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because not enough learning gains have been made. If student centered, standard-based instruction with rigor would occur, the problem would be reduced by 30% or more.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of African American Students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 23% to 67% and Math proficiency will increase from 44% to 73%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Vicki Grimm (grimmv@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implement effective intervention strategies based on the close monitoring of students with personalized learning plans. Ensure staff has access to real-time data specific to black students in order to have effective data chats and targeted support for improved learning. Implement Restorative Practices throughout the school. Utilize supports from district office to ensure interventions are in place and being implemented for black students who receive consent for evaluation. Culturally Responsive Teaching practices will be embedded into content focused professional learning sessions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies will focus on students' individualized needs and will disrupt the system of inequality for Black students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Equity-based PLC's and SBLT data chats will monitor the African American subgroup; target those who qualify for ELP or small intervention groups to increase reading and math proficiency. 2. Monitor weekly I-station progress for the African American subgroups. 3. During PLC and/or Collaborative Learning observe the progress of individual assignments/work samples of the students in the African American sub group to help identify those students needing interventions or enrichment. 4. African American students identified as needing accommodations will work with their teachers to set MAP goals and monitor their progress after each cycle. 5. Identified students will receive reading interventions using the JRGR program and/or small group time with the hourly teachers. 6. Small group math interventions will be made available to those students in this subgroup based upon proficiency data. 7. During PLCs, MAP data mining with Lauren Hansel with a focus on

goal-setting and differentiating instruction for increased student achievement.

8. Equity-based professional development during pre-planning and on-going throughout the school year.

9. Culturally Relevant Teaching strategies embedded within daily instruction.

**Person
Responsible**

Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	<p>Our current daily rate of attendance is 95.08%. We expect our performance level to be 98% or better by the end of the 2019-20 school year.</p> <p>The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because initial lack of parents to follow attendance reporting procedures and lack of follow up by staff.</p> <p>If more timely processes regarding the follow up of student absences would occur, the problem would be reduced by 3% or more.</p> <p>We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation of our strategies by monitoring attendance data and CST meetings bimonthly.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students missing more than 10% of school will decrease from 12% to 5% as measured by daily average attendance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all Tiers on an ongoing basis along with a positive recognition system for students with improved attendance rates.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Focusing on positive reinforcement will encourage students to attend school and to know they are missed when they are absent.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review attendance taking process and school-wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff. 2. Asset map the attendance resources, interventions and incentives at our school to support increased attendance for each Tier. 3. Develop and implement attendance incentive programs and competitions. 4. Engage students and families in attendance related activities to ensure they are knowledgeable of the data and aware of the importance of attendance. 5. Review data and effectiveness of school-wide attendance strategies on a bi-weekly basis. 6. Implement Tier 2 and 3 plans for student specific needs and review barriers and effectiveness on a bi-weekly basis. 6. Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes (e.g. Pending entries cleared).
Person Responsible	Cathy Carey (careyc@pcsb.org)

#7

Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	Currently Seminole has not earned a Healthy Schools award. We expect our performance to be a 6 out of 6 alliance for healthy generations, Healthy Schools for the Bronze level as evidenced, in the Alliance for a Healthier Generations Healthy Schools Program assessment. The problem/gap is occurring because we have not made a focus on increasing physical activity. If we implement a Healthy Schools Team to monitor the guidelines of the program we should qualify for the Bronze level award. Our school is eligible with 6 out of 6 modules for the bronze recognition or higher as evidenced in the Alliance for Healthier Generation's Healthy School's Program Framework. By April 2020 the application will be submitted.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve By May of 2020, 50% of the staff will participate in one of the "Be Smart" wellness programs and we will achieve a 6 out of 6 on the Alliance for Healthier Generations Healthy Schools Program.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Vicki Grimm (grimmv@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy Enhance the staff capacity to support students through purposeful and transfer strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy This strategy will support the development of traits for increased health.

Action Step

Description	1.Continue with Healthy Schools Team and monthly meetings R. Stevens Safety and Wellness committee Monthly - 2nd Monday of the month
	2.Complete the Healthy Schools Assessment Healthy Schools Team September- April
	3. Implement the Healthy Schools Program Action Plan Healthy Schools Team Ongoing
	4. Apply for Recognition R. Stevens Healthy Schools Team Complete by April 2020
Person Responsible	Sharon Wilson (wilsonsh@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	Family and Community Engagement
Rationale	We would like to increase the number of activities we provide for our families from 20 events to 23 events to capitalize on our families' cultures of origin and involvement.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May of 2020, we will implement a minimum of three new family events to engage families.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The school will engage all families and provide opportunities for families to be involved and support their child's academic success in school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	As parent engagement has decreased over the previous years, we want to increase the number of family events to help engage our families in the school.
Action Step	
Description	<p>Previous Events (20):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Pro Dads • I Mom's • BUGS awards • K-Kids • Rotary Club student luncheons • Authentic Martial Arts Events • Good News Club • VFW partnership – Veteran's Day event • PTA events • Ready, Set, Kindergarten • Meet Your Teacher event/Open House • Honor Roll, Principal's List, BUGS and Perfect Attendance assemblies. • Science Fair Night • SEM (Student Enrichment Model) – Showcase Night • Musical performances • PMAC – Multi Cultural Night • Pre K graduation • Kindergarten Moving-Up Ceremony • 5th grade Awards Program • Kindergarten Kick-Start <p>Future Events (3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter Festival • Community Skating events • Father/Daughter Dance <p>Person(s) responsible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers and staff • Administrators • PTA association • Volunteer Coordinator – all the partners and events they

sponsor

Specific Events, if not On-Going:

- August- May – monthly events
- August – Meet Your Teacher
- September - Open House
- After each grading period – Honors assemblies
- Science Fair – May
- Musicals – December, March, May
- SEM – May
- PMAC - February
- Ready, Set, Kindergarten – January and February

1. Purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to advocate for their students.

- Meet Your Teacher event
- Honor Roll, Principal's List, BUGS and Perfect Attendance assemblies.
- Science Fair Night
- SEM (Student Enrichment Model) – Showcase Night
- Musical performances
- PMAC – Multi Cultural Night
- Pre K graduation
- Kindergarten Moving-Up Ceremony
- 5th grade Awards Program
- Kindergarten Kick-Start

Person(s) Responsible:

- Administrators
- All instructional staff
- All staff
- Science Fair Co-ordinator
- V. Grimm and team for SEM
- L. Christy – Musicals
- A. Rosello & PMAC team

How often:

- August – Meet Your Teacher
- September - Open House
- After each grading period – Honors assemblies
- Science Fair – May
- Musicals – December, March, May
- SEM – May
- PMAC - February
- Ready, Set, Kindergarten – January and February

Person Responsible Sharon Wilson (wilsons@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)

None

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA Standards based instruction with academic rigor				\$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		140-Substitute Teachers	3911 - Seminole Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,700.00
			Notes: Provide TDEs for instructional staff in the curriculum areas of ELA, Math, & Science.			
		100-Salaries	3911 - Seminole Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$800.00
			Notes: Teachers provide intensive instruction via Kindergarten Kickstart Program for Reading letter/ sound, site words & assessments			
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Science standards based instruction with academic rigor				\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Math Standards based instruction with academic rigor				\$0.00
4	III.A	Areas of Focus: Conditions For Learning				\$0.00
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: Bridging The Gap- Black Student Achievement				\$0.00
6	III.A	Areas of Focus: Attendance				\$0.00
7	III.A	Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools				\$0.00
8	III.A	Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement				\$0.00
Total:						\$2,500.00