Shore Acres Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Shore Acres Elementary School

1800 62ND AVE NE, St Petersburg, FL 33702

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a rigorous educational program to prepare students to be life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Succeed Achieve Educate
100% Student Success

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sulte, Kristen	Principal	Instructional Leader
Waechter, Kristin	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader
DeCresie, Robyn	Teacher, K-12	SIP Development
Kiefel, Mariel	Teacher, K-12	SIP Development
Eddings, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	SIP Development
Luckey, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	SIP Development
Massey, Chelsea	Teacher, K-12	SIP Development
Lewis, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	SIP Development

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Prior to the end of the previous school year teachers review data, brainstorm barriers and strategies to implement toward 100% student achievement. All staff looked at their individual math and ELA data by sub groups to determine action steps. Draft SIP is shared with SAC for additions, clarifications and approval.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP is monitored after each Progress Monitoring Cycle with individual grade level teams. If necessary additional actions steps may be added to SIP. SIP is also reviewed with SAC after each progress monitoring cycle.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	35%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	50%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	29	39	27	24	24	33	0	0	0	176
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	14	8	10	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	10	8	6	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	15	23	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	9	18	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	13	13	15	0	0	0	41

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	18	17	20	19	26	0	0	0	100

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	39	22	22	28	27	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	8	3	12	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	7	3	12	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	21	15	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	20	13	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	5	12	9	6	0	0	0	35

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	10	21	13	35	25	0	0	0	106

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	39	22	22	28	27	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	8	3	12	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	7	3	12	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	21	15	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	20	13	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	5	12	9	6	0	0	0	35

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	10	21	13	35	25	0	0	0	106

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	59	54	53	62	55	56	53		
ELA Learning Gains				64			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			25		
Math Achievement*	75	61	59	72	51	50	62		
Math Learning Gains				78			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			33		
Science Achievement*	66	62	54	58	62	59	45		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	77	64	59	75			50		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	338
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	522
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	1	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	65			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	61			

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	62			
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	63			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	59			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	59			75			66					77
SWD	39			51			23				4	
ELL	23			46							3	77
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			45			57				3	
HSP	58			74			53				5	73
MUL	64			73							2	
PAC												
WHT	61			79			68				4	
FRL	50			63			54				5	82

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	62	64	48	72	78	65	58					75
SWD	47	72	67	53	75	62	56					
ELL	40	67		55	87							75
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46	57	40	49	64		38					
HSP	51	65	50	71	75	62	57					75
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	66	65	55	76	81	65	67					
FRL	52	65	48	57	71	66	51					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	53	43	25	62	55	33	45					50
SWD	41	50		46	60		10					
ELL	24			24								50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47	42		42	25		25					
HSP	31	31		46	58		38					55
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	59	41	31	68	56	50	46					
FRL	39	36	24	51	49	31	27					53

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
05	2023 - Spring	59%	57%	2%	54%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	58%	7%	58%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	53%	4%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	69%	62%	7%	59%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	66%	15%	61%	20%
05	2023 - Spring	71%	61%	10%	55%	16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	64%	60%	4%	51%	13%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

For the 22-23 school year our overall ELA performance remained at 62%. When reviewed with the last 3 years of data this has been consistent. A contributing factor to this number is the lack of performance of our students in the primary grades. This has led to foundational deficits in our 3rd through 5th grade students.

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

Our overall ELA data has remained stagnant over the last three years. A lack of foundational skills in the early grades and fluency are contributing factors. Our black students continue to show a gap in ELA and lack of stamina is a contributing factor.

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.

All data components are above the state average.

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

Our Math and Science showed improvement this year. A focused effort on collaboration and planning were actions that contributed to our success.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The area of most concern is ELA in grades K-2. There is a need to refine our small groups instruction so that it focuses on each students' area of need.

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

For the 23-24 school year:
ELA
• Ensure whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.
MATH
• Utilize district curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.
SCIENCE
• Deepen the understanding of the Florida's State Academic Standards for Science (FSASS – previously named NGSSS) as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.
POSITIVE CULTURE AND ENVIRONMENT
• A yearlong campaign to educate families and notify them of absences will be implemented.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on a review of data there is a need to ensure whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

65% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient on PM 3 of ELA FAST.
70 % of students in grade 3 will be proficient on PM 3 of ELA FAST.
75% of students in grades 4-5 will show growth based on PM 3 of ELA FAST.
75% of the lowest performing students in grades 4-5 will show growth based on PM 3 of ELA FAST.
Students in grades K- 2 will show 3-6 levels of growth on RR or be proficient based on grade level expectations.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monitoring towards outcome will occur after each Progress Monitoring cycle with all grade levels.
Administration will also share progress towards desired outcome to SAC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Ensure whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All teachers and grade levels reviewed their FAST data including subgroups. They brainstormed barriers to meeting our goals and selected the interventions.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

ELA
• Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.
• Literacy coaches prioritize time to those teachers, activities, and roles that will have the greatest impact on student achievement in reading, namely coaching, modeling, and mentoring in classrooms daily.
• Literacy coaches support and train teachers to administer assessments, analyze data and use data to

differentiate instruction.

• Provide regular structures for planning/PLCs where teachers regularly engage in data/student work analysis as well as intellectual prep and lesson rehearsal including planning for scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible: Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

Use district PCS Modules curriculum to provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in in complex, grade-level content, knowledge-building, and tasks aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark; and make strategic decisions about implementation of the curriculum to maximize impact on student learning.

Provide multiple opportunities for students to engage with module text in digital form using consistent graphic organizer.

Person Responsible: Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on a review of data there is a need to ensure the utilization of district curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

77% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient on PM 3 of MATH FAST.
75% of students in grades 4-5 will show growth based on PM 3 of MATH FAST.
75% of the lowest performing students in grades 4-5 will show growth based on PM 3 of MATH FAST.
80% of students in grades K-2 will be proficient on PM 3 of MATH FAST.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monitoring towards outcome will occur after each Progress Monitoring cycle with all grade levels. Administration will also share progress towards desired outcome to SAC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Utilize district curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers reviewed their FAST data including subgroups, brainstormed barriers and selected the interventions.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers and administrators schedule and facilitate ongoing mathematics topic planning sessions by grade level, using district provided resources and the PCS effective planning protocol. Focused efforts on planning for small groups to remediate foundational skills.

Employ instructional practices and routines that promote student-centered learning (Higher-Order Questioning, Pinellas Problem Solving Routine, Play-Explore-Investigate (PEI) Routine, Number Sense Making Routines, Collaborative structures, High-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback).

Continue the use of REFLEX math for basic facts

Person Responsible: Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)
By When: June 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on a review of data there is a need to ensure that all teachers deepen the understanding of the Florida's State Academic Standards for Science (FSASS – previously named NGSSS) as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

70% of students in grade 5 will score a level 3 or above on Florida's State Academic Standards for Science or FSASS.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monitoring towards outcome will occur after each Progress Monitoring cycle with all grade levels. Administration will also share progress towards desired outcome to SAC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Deepen the understanding of the Florida's State Academic Standards for Science (FSASS – previously named NGSSS) as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers in grade 5 reviewed their data including subgroups. They brainstormed barriers to meeting our goals and selected the interventions.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

During collaborative planning that occurs within school hours or after-school planning sessions, engage in standards articulation to gain a deeper understanding of prior knowledge and future learning to support students' holistic understanding of the Big Ideas in science. Focused efforts on Nature of Science and understanding common vocabulary K-5

Person Responsible: Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on a review of our EWS data, student attendance is an are that needs to be addressed. Over 21% or 138 students missed 10% or more of school which impacts student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

For the 23-24 school year the percentage of students missing 10% or more of school will be 15%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Child Study Team(CST) will meet twice a month to review data and plan for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

A yearlong campaign to educate families and notify them of absences will be implemented.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The lack of school attendance is a family issue so a focus on educating families needs to occur in order for an improvement in attendance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Tier 1
Create clarify flowchart of attendance is responsibilities assigned to all school personnel and provide professional development during preschool.
Distribute first day attendance packets to all families.

Person Responsible: Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023

Tier 1
Parent correspondence in month newsletters.
Student recognition after each grading period with brag tags and certificates.
Weekly shore bucks for students with perfect attendance

Person Responsible: Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

By When: Starting August 2023

Tier 2
Bi Weekly CST meetings to include- phone calls, letters, emails and in person follow up of families missing 10% or more of school.
Survey students and families on barriers to attending school and implement specific action plans.

Person Responsible: Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A data analysis of our subgroup ELA data indicates a need to address the achievement of our Black students. There continues to be a gap among our subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

On the 23-24 ELA FAST 60% of our Black students in grades 3-5 will meet proficiency. On the 23-24 ELA FAST 70% of our 4th and 5th graders will make a gain.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

FAST data will be monitored in September and January as well as district assessments during PLC to monitored progress towards goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Ensure that instructional supports are in place for our Black students during core instruction and independence as well as extensions and more advanced texts for student above the benchmark. These supports include access to grade level text as well as small group instruction based on data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Immersing students in grade level text with support will help to build stamina and allow students to practice skills independently.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

At weekly collaborative planning teams will plan to meet the needs of Black learners by identifying teaching strategies to use in lessons as supports for learners. At monthly PLC all grade levels will disaggregate and analyze data of our Black students and create action plans to remediate missed standards in small groups. Data will be monitored monthly.

Person Responsible: Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.