Pinellas County Schools

Starkey 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 |

Starkey Elementary School

9300 86TH AVE, Seminole, FL 33777

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

Demographics

Principal: Audrey Chaffin

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2010

| 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) | 77% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| School Grade | 2018-19: B |
| | 2017-18: B |
| | 2016-17: A |
| School Grades History | 2015-16: B |
| | 2014-15: B |
| | 2013-14: B |
| 2018-19 Differentiated Accountabil | ity (DA) Information* |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | <u>Tracy Webley</u> |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N |
| Year | А |

| ESSA Status | N/A |
|---|---|
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administra | ative Code. For more information, click |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

here.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

100% student success of achieving individual goals

Provide the school's vision statement

We will partner with families to inspire a love for learning as students achieve personal goals.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Chaffin, Audrey | Principal |
| Principal | |
| Harris, Tameka | Assistant Principal |
| Assistant Principal | |
| Terantino, Rachael | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Hall, Kimberly | Instructional Coach |
| Instructional Coach | |
| Lance, Melissa | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Ridge, Mary | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| McShane, Heather | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Loubet, Jamie | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Morgado, Jacquelyn | 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 | | | Total | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----|----|-------|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | iotai |
| Number of students enrolled | 84 | 85 | 97 | 108 | 101 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 576 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| 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 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | | | | | (| Gr | ade | e L | ev | el | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | iotai |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

37

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/23/2019

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 |
|------------|-------------|-------|
| illuicato. | Clade Ecrei | |

Students with two or more indicators

Prior Year - Updated

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

Last Modified: 8/19/2019 https://www.floridacims.org Page 6 of 22

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| malcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | iotai |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 17 | 18 | 19 | 16 | 16 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 26 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| In dianton | | | | | | Gra | ade | e L | ev | el | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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 Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | | | | |
| ELA Achievement | 61% | 54% | 57% | 57% | 50% | 56% | | | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 53% | 59% | 58% | 54% | 47% | 55% | | | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 41% | 54% | 53% | 38% | 40% | 48% | | | | |
| Math Achievement | 72% | 61% | 63% | 72% | 61% | 62% | | | | |
| Math Learning Gains | 70% | 61% | 62% | 66% | 56% | 59% | | | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 60% | 48% | 51% | 56% | 42% | 47% | | | | |
| Science Achievement | 69% | 53% | 53% | 68% | 57% | 55% | | | | |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Gı | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total | | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 84 (0) | 85 (0) | 97 (0) | 108 (0) | 101 (0) | 101 (0) | 576 (0) | | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 () | 10 () | 7 () | 9 () | 6 () | 8 () | 40 (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) | 1 (0) | 1 (0) | 3 (0) | 5 (0) | | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (0) | 19 (0) | 25 (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 | 71% | 56% | 15% | 58% | 13% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 53% | -6% | 57% | -10% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 24% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | Cohort Comparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 54% | 56% | -2% | 58% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 62% | 51% | 11% | 56% | 6% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 52% | 54% | -2% | 56% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 50% | 9% | 55% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | _ | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -10% | | | | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 69% | 62% | 7% | 62% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 62% | 2% | 62% | 2% |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | Cohort Comparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 75% | 64% | 11% | 64% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 69% | 62% | 7% | 62% | 7% |
| Same Grade Co | omparison | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 11% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 63% | 60% | 3% | 60% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 81% | 61% | 20% | 61% | 20% |
| Same Grade Co | Same Grade Comparison | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 65% | 54% | 11% | 53% | 12% | | | |
| | 2018 | 68% | 57% | 11% | 55% | 13% | | | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | 61 | 54 | | 61 | 58 | 60 | 42 | | | | |
| ELL | 53 | 67 | | 50 | 47 | | | | | | |

| | 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 | |
| ASN | 75 | 50 | | 92 | 70 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 38 | | 39 | 69 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 52 | 41 | | 65 | 59 | | 83 | | | | | |
| MUL | 71 | 60 | | 71 | 70 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 55 | 46 | 76 | 72 | 59 | 71 | | | | | |
| FRL | 50 | 50 | 42 | 61 | 63 | 55 | 60 | | | | | |

| | 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 | 58 | 69 | | 67 | 69 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | | | 53 | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 69 | 67 | | 81 | 75 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | | | 53 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 53 | | 70 | 61 | | 67 | | | | | |
| MUL | 71 | | | 71 | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 57 | 41 | 74 | 64 | 61 | 70 | | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 51 | 41 | 66 | 62 | 50 | 59 | | | | | |

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 | 65 |
| 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 | 93 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 519 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 56 |
| 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 | 62 |
| 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 | 72 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 68 |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | 68 NO |
| | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | NO |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Native American Students | NO |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Native American Students Federal Index - Native American Students | NO 0 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Native American Students Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO 0 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Native American Students Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | NO 0 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Native American Students Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students | NO 0 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Native American Students Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | NO 0 N/A 0 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Native American Students Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students | NO 0 N/A 0 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Native American Students Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | NO 0 N/A 0 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Native American Students Federal Index - Native American Students Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students | NO 0 N/A 0 N/A 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 54 |
| 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 Proficiency in 4th and 5th grade showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors include changes in staff within the school year, changes in curriculum, lack of understanding of the standards. We also had a loss of instructional time and technology due to construction and classroom movements throughout first semester.

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

Fifth grade math proficiency had the greatest decline when compared to the prior year. Contributing factors include loss of instructional time and technology due to construction and classroom movements.

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

ELA Proficiency in 4th and 5th grade had the greatest gap of -4% when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include changes in staff within the school year, changes in curriculum, lack of understanding of the standards, as well as loss of instructional time and technology due to construction and classroom movements.

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

Third grade ELA showed the most improvement. New actions taken were stronger collaboration among a new team with strengthened team planning and classroom routines. Also, a deeper understanding of MAP data led to stronger discussions for differentiated instruction.

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

Decreasing the percentage of students who are absent 10% or more of school will lead to higher student achievement.

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

Last Modified: 8/19/2019 https://www.floridacims.org Page 11 of 22

- 1. Standards-based curriculum
- 2. Culturally relevant teaching
- 3. Differentiated instruction driven by formative assessments
- 4. Classroom management and routines
- 5. Family involvement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| 4 | 7 |
|---|---|
| # | Т |

Title

ELA

Grades 3 - 5 students scored 61% proficiency in ELA as evidenced by the

2019 ELA FSA.

Rationale

53% of grades 4 - 5 students made learning gains and 41% of the L25

students made learning gains on the 2019 ELA FSA.

State the

school plans to achieve

measureable The percent of all grades 3 - 5 students achieving ELA proficiency will **outcome the** increase from 61% to 70% as measured by the 2020 ELA FSA.

Person responsible

for monitoring outcome

Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org)

Evidencebased Strategy

Provide professional development to better understand and implement standards-based curriculum, rigor strategies and classroom routines that impact time management with differentiating instruction.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy

This strategy was selected based on changes in curriculum and staff. We have to make sure our students are engaged in more rigorous, differentiated tasks with the updated and revised curriculum while staying aligned to the state standards in order to ensure more of our students are making yearly learning gains, while also increasing teacher knowledge.

Action Step

- 1. ELA Champions will facilitate professional development sessions and coach colleagues in literacy practices aligned to rigorous and differentiated tasks.
- 2. Administration will routinely provide feedback to teachers regarding implementation of rigorous and differentiated tasks.
- 3. Teachers will provide high-quality feedback related to the standards and then monitor the use of that feedback.

Description

- 4. Administration will conduct data chats with teachers and students.
- 5. Assess and analyze data to inform instruction in whole group, small group, as well as one-to-one instruction.
- 6. Train and involve families with literacy activities and events.
- 7. Provide students with culturally rich literature within classroom and school library.

Person Responsible

Rachael Terantino (terantinor@pcsb.org)

Last Modified: 8/19/2019 https://www.floridacims.org Page 12 of 22 #2

Title Math

Grades 3 - 5 students scored 72% proficiency in Math as evidenced by the

2019 Math FSA.

Rationale 70% of grades 4 - 5 students made learning gains and 65% of the L25

students made learning gains on the 2019 Math FSA.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

The percent of all grades 3 - 5 students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 72% to 80% as measured by the 2020 Math FSA.

Person responsible

for monitoring outcome Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org)

Evidencebased Strategy

Use Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, and Number Routines to provide rigorous, student-centered instruction daily.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy This strategy was selected based on changes in curriculum and staff. We have to make sure our students are engaged in more rigorous, differentiated tasks with the new adoption program while staying aligned to the state standards in order to ensure more of our students are making yearly learning gains and while also increasing teacher knowledge.

Action Step

- 1. Participate in curriculum meetings, PLCs, site-based and district-wide professional development.
- 2. Implement daily Number Routines at the start of the math block.
- Description
- 3. Administration will conduct data chats with teachers and students.
- 4. Assess and analyze MAP, unit assessment and Dreambox Learning data to inform instruction in whole group, small group, as well as one-to-one instruction.
- Train and involve families with mathematical activities and events.

Person Responsible

Jacquelyn Morgado (morgadoj@pcsb.org)

| #3 | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Title | Science | | | |
| Rationale | Grades 5 students scored 69% proficiency in Science as evidenced by the 2019 SSA. | | | |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | The percent of all grade 5 students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 69% to 75% as measured by the 2020 SSA. | | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org) | | | |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Effectively implement and monitor science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model, science labs, and vocabulary activities in alignment with grades 1-5 standards. | | | |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Based on Diagnostic Assessment data, Life Science requires the most review. Lack of vocabulary comprehension from grades 3 - 5 standards requires a deeper understanding and opportunities for integration. | | | |
| Action Step | | | | |
| Description | Provide ongoing professional development for the 5E instructional model. Implement and monitor science vocabulary academic gaming based on data. Develop, implement, and monitor a data driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th Grade Diagnostic Assessment. Implement and analyze Gr. 4 and 5 unit assessments to identify lowest scoring standards and adjust review plan accordingly. Administration will monitor lesson plans for use of 10-70-20 instructional routine. Train and involve families with science activities and events. | | | |
| Person Responsible | Rebecca Nash (nashre@pcsb.org) | | | |
| . 3.55 | | | | |

| #4 | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Title Rationale | Bridging the Gap % of grades 4 - 5 Black students made learning gains compared to% of grades 4 - 5 Non-black students on the 2019 ELA FSA. This shows a% achievement gap with learning gains. % of grades 4 - 5 L25 Black students made learning gains compared to% of grades 4 - 5 Non-black students on the 2019 ELA FSA. This shows a% achievement gap with L25 learning gains. The gap is occurring because Black students are not consistently being provided with culturally responsive content and resources. | | |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | The gap between Black and Non-black students meeting proficiency levels between the ELA FSA 2019 and ELA FSA 2020 will decrease by%. | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org) | | |
| Evidence-based Strategy | The teacher will connect students to academic content through practices that are culturally relevant and responsive. | | |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | This strategy will promote equity within classroom culture, lessons, and resources. | | |
| Action Step | | | |
| Description | Provide students with culturally rich literature within classroom and school library. Participate in professional development to support culturally relevant teaching (CRT). Teachers will use guiding questions within the 6 M's framework when planning. Teachers will reduce barriers to the curriculum resources and optimize levels of enrichment. Administrators will give specific, actionable feedback to teachers on structures and strategies being used, such as class meetings, restorative practices, circles, and cooperative learning. Staff will participate in a book study promoting Equity. | | |
| Person Responsible | Tameka Harris (harristam@pcsb.org) | | |
| | ise.a. | | |

| #5 | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Title | Family Involvement | | |
| Rationale | Increase parent participation and understanding with student data, goals, and curriculum. | | |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | Teachers will conduct parent conferences for 100% of their students by the end of first semester as opposed to 85% during the 2018 - 2019 school year. | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org) | | |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Provide academic tools and training for families to support their student's achievement at home. | | |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy | This strategy was selected so we can achieve learning gains for all students through a school-home connection. | | |
| Action Step | | | |
| Description | Create and utilize a checklist of critical discussion items to include during parent conferences. Participate in fishbowl and peer coaching professional development for effective parent conferences. Provide academic workshops for parents to support their student at home with content strategies. Conduct data chats with parents and students (MAP, FSA, grade level standards) to assist them with better understanding implications of the data. Host a Student Showcase of Learning Night for students to share and celebrate their progress with their families. Train and involve families with a variety of content rich activities and events, such as Literacy Night, Math Night, Science Showcase. | | |
| Person Responsible | Melissa Lance (lancem@pcsb.org) | | |

| #6 | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Title | Healthy Schools | | |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is Silver based on the Healthy School application. | | |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | We expect our performance level to maintain Silver status as evident by 2019 - 2020 Healthy School application. | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org) | | |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Optimize physical activity time at recess and incorporate movement within content lessons. | | |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | This strategy will create opportunities for increased health and fitness. | | |
| Action Step | | | |
| Description | Enhance recess area with more equipment and shade. Incorporate the 6 M's Instructional Model in lesson plans. Monitor compliance with the Pinellas County Nutritional Guidelines. | | |
| Person Responsible | Ann Purpura (purpuraa@pcsb.org) | | |

| #7 | |
|--|--|
| Title | Attendance |
| Title | |
| Rationale | 15% of our students were absent 10% or more of the 2018 - 2019 school year with 94% being our current average daily attendance rate. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | We expect our attendance rate to decrease from 15% absent to 10% or more to 10% at the end of the 2019 - 2020 school year. We would like to increase our average attendance rate 94% to 96% . |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all Tiers on an ongoing basis. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Decreasing the percentage of students who are absent 10% or more from school will lead to higher student achievement. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | Attendance training session will be provided at a staff meeting during the first month of school. Implement and monitor attendance incentive programs. Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis that also reflects the appropriate entry codes. Share data and effectiveness of school-wide attendance strategies regularly with staff and families. Implement Tier 2 and 3 plans for student specific needs and review barriers on a bi-weekly basis in a prompt manner. |
| Person Responsible | Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org) |

| 40 | |
|--|---|
| #8 | |
| Title | School Climate/Conditions for Learning |
| | Our end of the year 2019 discipline data showed 54 referrals, |
| Rationale | 9 in-school and 2 out-of school suspensions. |
| | |
| State the measureable | We expect to end the 2020 school year with 45 or less |
| outcome the school plans | referrals. |
| to achieve | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Incorporate more restorative practices between staff, |
| Evidence-based Strategy | students, and parents. |
| Rationale for Evidence- | Support a better understanding of equitable practices that engage students in acknowledging and adhering to processes |
| based Strategy | and procedures. |
| Action Step | |
| | 1. Review student and teacher data monthly for trends and |
| | next steps. |
| | 2. Enlist Tier 2/3 interventions within MTSS process promptly |
| | with appropriate coaching for fidelity and data collection. 3. Monitor and regularly communicate expectations and |
| Description | updates with our PBIS to staff and families. |
| | 4. Provide professional development for classroom |
| | management and routines. |
| | 5. Provide professional development for Equity, CRT, |
| | Restorative Practices. |
| Person Responsible | Tameka Harris (harristam@pcsb.org) |
| | |

| #9 | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Title | AVID | | |
| Rationale | Implementation of instructional strategies from AVID CRT will be used to increase engagement of diverse learners. | | |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 61% to 70%, as measured by 2020 ELA FSA. | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Audrey Chaffin (chaffina@pcsb.org) | | |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Increase the staff capacity to support students with Culturally Relevant Teaching (CRT). | | |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Participating in professional development for AVID CRT will give teachers more insight, and tools to use, with diverse learners. | | |
| Action Step | | | |
| Description | Conduct a "Wake Up with AVID" school-based training session each grading period to support WICOR. Visit to observe and collaborate with demonstration AVID schools for best practices in action. Monitor K-5 Progression Plan that outlines WICOR strategies expected to be implemented in each grade. Each class will create a SMART goal to support ELA achievement that will be referenced at administrator/teacher and teacher/student data chats. A week-long Cultural Showcase will be held second semester to bring awareness and celebrations of diversity among our families and staff culminating in a Cultural Parade. 40% of instructional staff will participate in AVID CRT district trainings. | | |
| Person Responsible | Jamie Loubet (loubetj@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 | | | \$800.00 | | |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 | |
| | 7200 | 510-Supplies | 4331 - Starkey Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$800.00 | |

| | | | Notes: Classroom books will be po will also be needed for Literacy N | | e cultural | diversity. Supplies |
|--|---|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| 2 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Math | | | | \$200.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 500-Materials and Supplies | 4331 - Starkey Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$200.00 |
| | | | Notes: Math supplies will be purch Math Night with families. | hased to support ha | nds-on ex | periences and |
| 3 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Science | | | | \$200.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 500-Materials and Supplies | 4331 - Starkey Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$200.00 |
| | Notes: Materials will be used to support hands-on learning expessions projects throughout the year. | | | | | |
| 4 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Bridging | g the Gap | | | \$500.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 500-Materials and Supplies | 4331 - Starkey Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$500.00 |
| | | | Notes: Funds will be used to purc. Equity. | hase books for a sta | aff book st | udy focused on |
| 5 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Family I | nvolvement | | | \$135.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 500-Materials and Supplies | 4331 - Starkey Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$135.00 |
| | | | Notes: Supplies will be needed fo materials to better support paren conferences. | | | |
| 6 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Healthy | \$0.00 | | | |
| 7 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Attendance | | | | \$200.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 510-Supplies | 4331 - Starkey Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$200.00 |
| | Notes: Funds will be used for awards and incentives. | | | | | |
| 8 III.A Areas of Focus: School Climate/Conditions for Learning | | | \$600.00 | | | |

| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
|---|---|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| | 7200 | | 4331 - Starkey Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$600.00 |
| | | | Notes: Funds will be used to supp | oort our PBIS reward | s and Star | rkey Store. |
| 9 | III.A | Areas of Focus: AVID | | | | \$740.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 330-Travel | 4331 - Starkey Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$400.00 |
| | | | Notes: Expenses for travel will be demonstration sites. | incurred when visit | ing to lear | rn from AVID |
| | 7200 | 140-Substitute Teachers | 4331 - Starkey Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$140.00 |
| Notes: 2 substitute teachers will be r sites. | | | | be needed when vis | iting AVID | demonstration |
| | 7200 | 510-Supplies | 4331 - Starkey Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$200.00 |
| | Notes: Display boards and miscellaneous supplies will be needed for the Cultura Showcase. | | | | ed for the Cultural | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$6,750.00 |