# Fellsmere Elementary School



# 2019-20 School Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Fellsmere Elementary School

## 50 N CYPRESS ST, Fellsmere, FL 32948

### www.indianriverschools.org

**Demographics**

## Principal: Ramon Echeverria J

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2019

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 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) | Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| **School Grade** | 2018-19: C |
| **School Grades History** | 2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: D 2013-14: C |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Diane Leinenbach |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | NOT IN DA |
| **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 Indian River 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.](http://www.floridacims.org)

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement**

We exist to achieve high levels of learning for ALL students!
Gallop to Success...Nothing Less!

**Provide the school's vision statement**

We believe all children can learn and we will establish high standards of learning that we expect all
students to attain. As educators, we strive to create an environment that engages students in
challenging curricula that results in a high level of achievement. As a school, we work collaboratively
with colleagues, students, parents and the community to achieve this shared educational purpose.

### School Leadership Team

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------|-------------------------------|
| Echeverria, Ramon | Principal | |
| Matheny, Lyndsey | Assistant Principal | |
| houston, jody | Instructional Coach | |
| Mowery , Jessica | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Libby, Amanda | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Horton, Michele | Teacher, K-12 | |
| newkirk, karen | Instructional Media | |
| Marsiglia, Judy | Administrative Support | |
| tessier, nicole | Teacher, K-12 | |
| marceleno, veronica | Administrative Support | |
| Alderton, Jennifer | Instructional Coach | |
| Arbuckle, Natalie | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Essig, Paula | Instructional Coach | |
| Morales, Meaghan | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Stolzmann, Brittany | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Wolfe, Benajmin | Teacher, ESE | |
| Williams, Rachel | Guidance Counselor | |

### 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 | 94 | 81 | 82 | 122 | 73 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 548 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 19 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 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)**
30

**Date this data was collected or last updated**
Wednesday 8/21/2019

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

# Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**School Data**
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 41% | 58% | 57% | 41% | 57% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 46% | 57% | 58% | 42% | 55% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | 54% | 53% | 47% | 49% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 57% | 63% | 63% | 57% | 63% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 67% | 60% | 62% | 71% | 61% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 63% | 48% | 51% | 63% | 52% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 37% | 54% | 53% | 49% | 55% | 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 | 94 (0) | 81 (0) | 82 (0) | 122 (0) | 73 (0) | 96 (0) | 548 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 () | 8 () | 8 () | 5 () | 3 () | 2 () | 26 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 3 (0) | 3 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 15 (0) | 19 (0) | 23 (0) | 57 (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 | 45% | 60% | -15% | 58% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 56% | -6% | 57% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 45% | 61% | -16% | 58% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 56% | -16% | 56% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 30% | 54% | -24% | 56% | -26% |
| | 2018 | 31% | 52% | -21% | 55% | -24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -10% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 03 | 2019 | 51% | 64% | -13% | 62% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 56% | 60% | -4% | 62% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 63% | 64% | -1% | 64% | -1% |
| | 2018 | 54% | 63% | -9% | 62% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 53% | 57% | -4% | 60% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 54% | 58% | -4% | 61% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2019 | 35% | 53% | -18% | 53% | -18% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 54% | -8% | 55% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| 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 | 12 | 38 | 50 | 25 | 63 | 65 | 5 | | | | |
| ELL | 37 | 45 | 52 | 55 | 67 | 68 | 30 | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 46 | 49 | 58 | 68 | 64 | 37 | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | 40 | | 55 | 60 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 46 | 50 | 57 | 67 | 63 | 37 | | | | |

### 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 | 12 | 28 | 40 | 29 | 56 | 50 | 29 | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 42 | 52 | 50 | 66 | 59 | 26 | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 30 | | 18 | 60 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 42 | 45 | 57 | 73 | 62 | 46 | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 43 | | 66 | 67 | | 69 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 42 | 47 | 57 | 71 | 63 | 50 | | | | |

## 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 56 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 417 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

### Subgroup Data

#### Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 38 |
| 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 | |
|---|---|
| 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 | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 52 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Multiracial Students** | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Native American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Pacific Islander Students** | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **White Students** | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 52 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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**

Students with disabilities subgroup, Science overall proficiency, both areas of learning gains in ELA (bottom quartile and overall)

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

Science Proficiency declined 11% points.
Contributing factors: low proficiency on ELA assessment, lack of integration of science and ELA strategies, Tier 1 instructional practices in all grades K-5

**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**

Greatest gaps include: OVERALL ELA proficiency, ELA Learning Gains, Science Proficiency, and students with disabilities ELA Learning Gains
Contributing factors: Tier 1 instructional practices in place for ALL students, lack of alignment of services and supports for students receiving intervention or ESE support

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

Overall, our overall learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains showed improvement over the previous years data. We began implementing more focused strategies across all grade levels. We implemented Embedded professional development times for all grade levels with a focus on ELA and math.

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

Learning gains for students scoring Level 1 on state assessments

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

1. ELA learning gains for all students
2. ELA learning gains for students with disabilities (ESSA identified below 41%)
3. ELA bottom quartile (bottom 25%) Learning Gains

4. Science Proficiency
5. Math Overall Learning Gains and bottom quartile Learning Gains

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | ELA Learning Gains for ALL students- including Students with Disabilities |
| **Rationale** | After data analysis, the Leadership Team at Fellsmere Elementary has identified ELA Learning Gains for all students to be a top priority. Students must be successful in ELA in order to reach the highest levels of achievement in all subject areas and as they continue on in our ever changing world. Additionally, teachers who instruct students with disabilities need to diverse techniques and tools to reach this subgroup of students. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | If all teachers are trained in evidence based, effective ELA strategies for all Tiers of Instruction, all subgroups, including SWDs, will make learning gains as evidenced on the Spring administration of the FSA assessment and I-Ready Spring Diagnostics. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Systematic literacy instruction at ALL Tiers and in all settings, including ESE supports, that includes all components of English Language Arts. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | If students area receiving aligned ELA instruction across all Tiers and in all settings, growth and achievement will increase in all areas of ELA and in other content areas as well. By providing evidence based strategies, starting at a Tier 1 level, students will develop and maintain stronger literacy skills. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Provide embedded and ongoing PD to teachers across all levels that focuses on the components of literacy<br>2. Monitor for implementation of the strategies (carry over from PD)<br>3. Monitor for the effectiveness of the strategies through data chats at every Tier<br>4. Coaches and Administration collaboratively plan with ALL grade levels and departments to ensure that strategies are being used effectively in the planning process<br>5. Implement an after school program that focuses on BQ students and SWDs<br>6. Ongoing data chats |
| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Alderton (jennifer.alderton@indianriverschools.org) |

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Science Proficiency and Overall Content Knowledge in ALL Grades- PD |
| **Rationale** | After data analysis, the Leadership Team at Fellsmere Elementary has identified Science content knowledge and the need for proficiency for all students at each grade level to be a priority. Teachers must be knowledgeable enough to effectively deliver science instruction so that students are able to consistently apply their knowledge in all settings. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | If all teachers are trained in evidence based, effective Science and problem solving strategies for all Tiers of Instruction, all subgroups, including SWDs, will make learning gains as evidenced on the Spring administration of the statewide science assessment and teacher/district created formative assessments. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Teachers will be provided with professional learning opportunities centered around the components of strong science instruction with a focus on the 5 E model. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | When students are provided strong science instruction at all Tier levels including during ESE support times, based on the 5E process, problem solving and application of content knowledge will be retained and applied at a higher rate. |

**Action Step**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | 1. Provide ongoing professional development to all teachers in all departments and grade levels with a focus on science<br>2. monitor the effectiveness of implementation<br>3. monitor the effectiveness and the impact of the strategy by looking at student data<br>4. provide opportunities and spaces for teachers and students to participate in hands on science learning experiences (science lab, STEAM Days, science integrated the media center special, robotics/programming with robots and I-Pads)<br>5. After school campus that focus on science problem solving and investigative cycles |
| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |

| #3 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Teaching Social Emotional Learning through our school wide PBIS framework/expectations |
| **Rationale** | Social emotional learning is the process by which students can develop positive attitudes, behaviors, and a skill set that will assist them with their daily interactions with people including both peers and adults. When students have a strong social/emotional foundation, they have the ability to improve in all areas. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | Amount of student CIRs and ODRs will be reduced when compared to the 2018-2019 data. We will also have an overall attendance rate that is higher than the 2018-2019 school year. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Rachel Williams (rachel.williams@indianriverschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Implementing PBIS expectations, Sanford Harmony, and social skills groups school wide, class wide, and individually and recognizing and reinforcing positive choices with fidelity. Teachers and staff are also provided with feedback on ways to continue to improve their PBIS/Sanford Harmony implementation. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | When students are reinforced for positive choices, class and school culture improves and influences all areas of a student's education. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. PBIS Committee meetings scheduled monthly to determine needs of students and staff<br>2. PBIS team will meet with teachers to share feedback and information based on classroom walkthroughs<br>3. Monthly CIR and ODR data will be shared at staff meetings with a focus on equity reports<br>4. Weekly and quarterly recognition for students who are following PBIS expectations |
| **Person Responsible** | Rachel Williams (rachel.williams@indianriverschools.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)**

Math LGs and BQ LGs: Math coach will become part of the specials rotation in grade 3-5 in order to provide math instruction to ALL students while also monitoring skills progression on I-Ready and Fastt Math. Coach also has time set aside to provide embedded professional development and collaboratively plan with ALL grade levels and departments. Data chats have been scheduled that will focus on math data.

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

**Additional Title I Requirements**
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students**

Family Nights for Growth Mindset and Content Areas, community events such as Bike to School Day- Donuts with Dads- Fellsmere Day- Frog Leg Festival, musical events, track events, awards night, graduations, conference nights, Open House, PTA events

**PFEP Link**
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services**

We have a school wide Stanford Harmony program that is utilized to ensure positive classroom and school culture. We also have PBIS which is implemented school wide and it focuses on behavioral expectations for all settings with incentives (individual, class, school).

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another**

We have collaboration among grade levels to support ALL students as they transition to higher grade levels. This collaboration allows teachers to create expectations that are on a continuum making the transition to different grade more effective. We also set up times to meet with middle school counselors to discuss student needs prior to them attending the following school year.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact**

Students receive Tier 1 support in behavioral expectations. If students are identified as needing additional support, our BIS and administration is involved with process of putting in supports. If a student is in need of further support, the MTSS team meets to problems behaviors and put additional supports in place with parent input.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations**

We have a community partnership with the Fellsmere Police Department that supports our students and our mission for academic excellence. Additionally, we have in place 2 days where parents and community members are invited to read with our students and share their academic and/or career journey.

| | | **Part V: Budget** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains for ALL students- including Students with Disabilities** | | | | **$20,000.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 5100 | 140-Substitute Teachers | 0101 - Fellsmere Elementary School | General Fund | | $20,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Subs for ongoing data chats Supplemental instructional materials ELO Camps Supplemental supplies for after school programs* | | | |
| **2** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Science Proficiency and Overall Content Knowledge in ALL Grades- PD** | | | | **$22,000.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0101 - Fellsmere Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | $22,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: PD workshops and instructional rounds with consultant I-Pads Robotics Supplemental instructional materials* | | | |
| **3** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Teaching Social Emotional Learning through our school wide PBIS framework/expectations** | | | | **$5,000.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0101 - Fellsmere Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | $5,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: recognition incentives and programs* | | | |
| | | | | | **Total:** | **$47,000.00** |