

Alachua County Public Schools

# Chester Shell Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Chester Shell Elementary School

21633 SE 65TH AVE, Hawthorne, FL 32640

<https://www.sbac.edu/shell>

## Demographics

**Principal: Holly Burton**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	<p>Black/African American Students</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged Students</p> <p>Multiracial Students</p> <p>Students With Disabilities</p> <p>White Students</p>
<b>School Grades History</b>	<p>2018-19: C (44%)</p> <p>2017-18: C (41%)</p> <p>2016-17: B (57%)</p> <p>2015-16: D (40%)</p>
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

## 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.

The faculty and staff at Shell Elementary School are dedicated to providing a safe, positive, and enriching environment where each student is empowered and inspired to reach his or her full academic, social and leadership potential. Through a collaborative atmosphere, the faculty and staff of Shell Elementary will model the ideals of respect, diversity, cooperation, leadership and diligence.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Shell Elementary School aims to cultivate a partnership where school, home, and the community support the well-rounded development of the children we serve. We will create challenging, diverse, and a differentiated learning environment with the aim of shaping our students into self-sufficient, confident, and responsible leaders.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Burton, Holly	Principal	
Carter, Isabel	Assistant Principal	
Harrington, Seth	Dean	
Mitchell, Stacey	Guidance Counselor	
Robinson, Kathleen	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Holly Burton

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

32

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: D (40%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	44	64	59	55	64	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350
Attendance below 90 percent	3	16	14	13	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

**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	6	3	3	9	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	2	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 9/10/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

**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	
Number of students enrolled	56	60	56	66	56	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	342
Attendance below 90 percent	6	16	12	17	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	10	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	14	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	5	5	6	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

**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	6	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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
Number of students enrolled	56	60	56	66	56	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	342
Attendance below 90 percent	6	16	12	17	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	10	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	14	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	1	5	5	6	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

**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	6	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	44%	59%	57%	52%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	57%	58%	50%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	49%	53%	46%	48%	52%
Math Achievement	40%	60%	63%	69%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	32%	61%	62%	70%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	49%	51%	58%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	57%	53%	56%	55%	51%



### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	57%	1%	58%	0%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	55%	-17%	58%	-20%
	2018	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
05	2019	34%	55%	-21%	56%	-22%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	58%	-2%	62%	-6%
	2018	65%	60%	5%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	21%	60%	-39%	64%	-43%
	2018	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2019	41%	57%	-16%	60%	-19%
	2018	60%	61%	-1%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	34%	55%	-21%	53%	-19%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	24	42	62	21	25	42					
BLK	28	45	67	17	6	8	17				
MUL	60			50							
WHT	47	48	67	49	38	60	39				
FRL	42	51	65	37	32	36	26				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	28	21	29	27	37	38					
BLK	40	27	27	38	30	40	37				
WHT	49	31	27	67	30	36	63				
FRL	45	29	26	54	30	41	51				
2017 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	8	38	29	19	52	47	18				
BLK	38	43	31	51	62	50	29				
MUL	60			80							
WHT	58	57	64	76	74	64	71				
FRL	45	48	43	66	69	56	52				

### 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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	307

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Native American Students	
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	50
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	41
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.**

The overall learning gains in Math for grades 3 -5 have stayed at 32% since the 18-19 school year. Twenty one percent of our fourth graders scored proficient in math; A 44% decrease in proficiency for this same group of students in third grade. Historically, fourth graders at Shell have trouble maintaining proficiency in Math. For the past two years, we have departmentalized fourth grade and have had new teacher teams each year. This could be a contributing factor to low proficiency rates in Math as new teachers need time to become experts in the curriculum and students may not be ready to learn in a departmentalized setting.

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

Both Math and Science achievement show the greatest decline from prior years' testing. Our professional development and PLC focus for the past two year years has been in ELA. We believe the lack of targeted focus on the study of Math and Science standards by our leadership team and teachers is one of the main contributing factors to this decline.

**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.**

There is a 30% gap in Math achievement between our school and state data. The factors that have contributed to this gap include a lack of targeted focus on the study of Math standards by our leadership team and teachers.

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

Our strongest category this year was among our students in ELA lowest quartile. We increased learning gains from 26% to 69% of our LQ students showing growth. Although standards-based planning has been a focal point of our collaborative planning meetings these past four years, this year fifth grade ELA teachers worked together to develop common assessments and review results on a weekly basis. This practice allowed teachers to discuss and analyze test specifications and limits as well as identify specific gaps in learning for students. As a result, teachers were able to implement more focused interventions for students who were not showing mastery on specific standards.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

A potential area of concern for our school is attendance. Approximately 23% of our student population attends school less than 90% of the time. We find that most of the students who are frequently absent are also the students who are in need of intervention in all core subjects.

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

1. Math achievement and learning gains
2. Science Achievement
3. Student Attendance
4. Learning gains for SWD
5. Close racial achievement gap

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Learning gains of the lowest quartile - Our current data shows a significant decline in learning gains among our lowest quartile in Math while our ELA lowest quartile students have shown tremendous gains. It's essential that we increase the percentage of students in the lowest quartile making Math learning gains while also maintaining the growth we have seen in ELA.

**Measureable Outcome:** Shell Elementary will increase the learning gains of the lowest quartile students both in Math and ELA by 1% (Math - 42%, ELA - 70%).

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Holly Burton (burtonha@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** While continuing to provide opportunities for teacher teams to collaboratively plan for standards-based ELA instruction and intervention, we will also implement a targeted approach to instructional intervention and remediation in Math by using more frequent progress monitoring such as half-AIMS, ISIP data, and common formative assessments to facilitate teacher and student data chats.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** For the past three years, we have focused on improving our teachers' knowledge of ELA standards and instructional strategies for intervention. The ELA learning gains data shows that this strategy has worked (43% increase). We will continue to support these efforts, however, it is important that we transfer the structure of the ELA continuous improvement model to Math this year.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Train paraprofessionals in SIPPs (ELA intervention program)

**Person Responsible** Stacey Mitchell (mitchesp@gm.sbac.edu)

Facilitate weekly collaborative planning meetings focused on standards alignment, best instructional practices (AVID strategies), and intervention resources.

**Person Responsible** Kathleen Robinson (robinsonkh@gm.sbac.edu)

Facilitate monthly data chats using half-AIMs, standards-based common assessments, and ISIP math data

**Person Responsible** Isabel Carter (carterig@gm.sbac.edu)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Proficiency among African American students at Shell was 28% for ELA (a 19% achievement gap) and 17% for Math (a 32% achievement gap). This data indicates a need to shift perspectives around teaching and learning systematically across grade levels to better meet the needs of our African American students.

**Measureable Outcome:** Increase achievement of African American students from 28% to 41% in ELA and 17% to 41% in Math.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Holly Burton (burtonha@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Continue year two implementation of AVID in grades 3-5 in order to foster the skill sets among our African American students: Student Agency, Rigorous Academic Preparedness, and Opportunity Knowledge.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Implementing the AVID program in grades 2 - 5 will support teachers in embedding high-yield instructional strategies in Math and ELA lessons and provide students with learning environments that promote critical thinking skills in alignment with the rigor of the Florida standards. The AVID framework provides a much needed structure to address key components of academic success such as organization, reading and writing to learn, inquiry, student discourse and collaboration. Teachers receive ongoing training and support focused around mastering the use of these strategies within instructional lessons resulting in highly engaging and rigorous learning environments that provide the needed scaffolds for every learner.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers participate in AVID XP institutes throughout the school year to support continuous learning and growth in high yield strategies.

**Person Responsible:** Isabel Carter (carterig@gm.sbac.edu)

Facilitate monthly professional development focused on AVID strategies as well as implementation of standards-aligned lessons that are high interest for students.

**Person Responsible:** Kathleen Robinson (robinsonkh@gm.sbac.edu)

Maintain small class sizes in grades 3 - 5 to ensure frequent opportunities for students to receive individual and small group intervention support.

**Person Responsible:** Holly Burton (burtonha@gm.sbac.edu)

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Although lowest quartile learning gains among SWD in ELA (62%) and Math (42%) exceed the federal index for proficiency, achievement among SWD at Shell is lower than overall achievement with ELA proficiency at 24% and Math at 21%. This data indicates a need to identify SWD who may need additional support early on with more frequent monitoring and make changes or modifications to instruction as soon as student fails to make progress.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase achievement of students with disabilities from 24% to 41% in ELA and 21% to 41% in Math.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Holly Burton (burtonha@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will implement a targeted approach to instructional intervention and remediation in Math and ELA by using more frequent progress monitoring such as half-AIMS, ISIP data, and common formative assessment to facilitate data chats that will inform instructional decisions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Identifying the needs of our SWD early on, providing a structure for teachers to monitor their progress, and making immediate modifications to instruction based on this data will enable our school to better leverage the resources and make decisions that will positively impact academic achievement among SWD.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Facilitate monthly data chats using half-AIMs, standards-based common assessments, and ISIP math data

**Person Responsible** Isabel Carter (carterig@gm.sbac.edu)

Train paraprofessionals in SIPPs and other intervention approaches.

**Person Responsible** Stacey Mitchell (mitchesp@gm.sbac.edu)

Facilitate weekly collaborative planning meetings focused on standards alignment, best instructional practices (AVID strategies), and intervention resources.

**Person Responsible** Kathleen Robinson (robinsonkh@gm.sbac.edu)

Provide training and refresher training on MTSS and RTI process to new and veteran teachers.

**Person Responsible** Stacey Mitchell (mitchesp@gm.sbac.edu)

Facilitate monthly meetings with ESE team to discuss student progress and teacher support.

**Person Responsible** Holly Burton (burtonha@gm.sbac.edu)



**#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our out of school suspensions have increased in the past three years. During the 19-20 school year in particular, we saw an increase in violent suspensions involving bus drivers. Students were suspended and in some cases referred to alternative settings. This data shows a need to implement more proactive measures that support social emotional learning and incentives for appropriate behaviors during unstructured times (i.e. bus, playground, etc.).

**Measureable Outcome:** We will reduce out of school suspensions by 15% this school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Holly Burton (burtonha@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Although we have successfully Implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) school-wide for multiple years, we will expand positive behavior supports to school buses that transport our students. Additionally, we will focus on using tier 2 interventions and strategies more consistently across school campus with at risk students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** PBIS is a research-based framework for preventing, reducing, and replacing problem behaviors. The intervention and supports for tier two behaviors we will implement this year include small groups sessions focused on SEL and behavior expectations, adult mentors, bus incentives, and behavior contracts.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Utilize BRT aide to check in with tier 2 students and facilitate schoolwide incentives (Mustang Market, Caught Slips)

**Person Responsible** Seth Harrington (harrinsj@gm.sbac.edu)

Plan and initiate behavior incentives for bus riders.

**Person Responsible** Seth Harrington (harrinsj@gm.sbac.edu)

Monitor students' progress via suspension data, behavior contracts, and teacher /mentor feedback

**Person Responsible** Seth Harrington (harrinsj@gm.sbac.edu)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**An area that we need to continuously work on is student attendance. We will continue to recognize good attendance via student incentives as well as promote school attendance and participation through social media and other online platforms.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

See PFEP at the link below.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

## Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$42,766.10
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	520-Textbooks	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$3,379.54
			<i>Notes: Ready Florida Math Instruction and Intervention in the classroom</i>			
	5100	110-Administrators	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$12,723.75
			<i>Notes: Principal Specialist</i>			
	5100	520-Textbooks	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$3,379.57
			<i>Notes: Ready Florida ELA Instruction and Intervention in the classroom</i>			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$5,806.00
			<i>Notes: Achieve 3000</i>			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$2,636.00
			<i>Notes: Reflex Math</i>			
	5900	120-Classroom Teachers	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$7,546.24

			<i>Notes: teacher stipends for extended day</i>			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$3,295.00
			<i>Notes: IXL Math</i>			
	5100	730-Dues and Fees	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Other		\$4,000.00
			<i>Notes: AVID membership dues and pd modules</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American</b>				<b>\$253,853.26</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	520-Textbooks	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$4,491.61
			<i>Notes: Write Source lesson plans and assessments</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A	2.5	\$177,448.58
			<i>Notes: One primary classroom unit, one intermediate classroom unit to decrease class size and .50 intervention unit</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$67,952.83
			<i>Notes: Instructional Intervention Coach and Lead Title I Teacher supplement</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$1,960.32
			<i>Notes: Title I Lead Teacher Supplement</i>			
	5100	390-Other Purchased Services	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$1,999.92
			<i>Notes: Substitutes for Class-size reduction units</i>			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities</b>				<b>\$59,980.64</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	150-Aides	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A	2.03	\$59,980.64
			<i>Notes: Three instructional paraprofessionals</i>			
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Discipline</b>				<b>\$6,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	330-Travel	0281 - Chester Shell Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$6,000.00
			<i>Notes: AVID Summer Institute</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$362,600.00</b>