

Pinellas County Schools

Pinellas Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 18 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 18 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 20 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 21 |

Pinellas Park Elementary School

7520 52ND ST N, Pinellas Park, FL 33781

<https://www.pcsb.org/pp-es>

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.

All stakeholders will work together in a cooperative partnership which will enable our students to become college and career ready. Together we will provide a balanced curriculum which is driven by data and based on individual student needs.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a community, we will provide the necessary support to all students so they are college and career ready, reaching the highest level of achievement.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Harris, Carmen | Principal | Monitor the implementation of the plan with fidelity. |
| Ruscetta, Mark | Assistant Principal | Monitor fidelity of plan and support implementation |
| Sivon, Julie | Reading Coach | Develop Steps to the plan and support with monitoring the plan |
| Hawley, Katherine | Math Coach | Develop Steps to the plan and support with monitoring the plan |
| Givens, Gary | Behavior Specialist | Develop Steps to the plan and support with monitoring the plan |
| Whitaker, Danny | Instructional Coach | Develop Steps to the plan and support with monitoring the plan |

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.

Monthly Meetings that share these strategies and monitor if they are evident, using checklist and look-fors specifically related to the actions items supporting the goals established in the plan.

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))

The SIP plan will be reviewed monthly during staff meetings and discussed during the virtual SAC Meetings. Action items will be reviewed with the Academic Services Team and Student Services Teams.

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 KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 67% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| 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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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 | 5 | 27 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Course failure in ELA | 2 | 19 | 12 | 15 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Course failure in Math | 2 | 22 | 33 | 11 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 30 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 18 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 4 | 25 | 39 | 42 | 20 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 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 | 5 | 27 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Course failure in ELA | 2 | 19 | 12 | 15 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Course failure in Math | 2 | 22 | 33 | 11 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 30 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 18 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 4 | 25 | 39 | 42 | 20 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 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* | 28 | 54 | 53 | 39 | 55 | 56 | 38 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 53 | | | 47 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 53 | | | 50 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 28 | 61 | 59 | 50 | 51 | 50 | 41 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 63 | | | 35 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 44 | | | 39 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 34 | 62 | 54 | 57 | 62 | 59 | 38 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 65 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 52 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 57 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 67 | 64 | 59 | 68 | | | 89 | | |

* 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](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 37 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 7 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 184 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 53 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 427 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| 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 | 12 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | 27 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 47 | | | |
| BLK | 20 | Yes | 4 | 2 |
| HSP | 39 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | 34 | Yes | 1 | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 29 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| FRL | 35 | Yes | 1 | |

| 2021-22 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 | 37 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 54 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 77 | | | |
| BLK | 31 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| HSP | 52 | | | |

| 2021-22 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% |
| MUL | 57 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | | | |
| FRL | 50 | | | |

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 | 28 | | | 28 | | | 34 | | | | | 67 |
| SWD | 9 | | | 11 | | | 7 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 15 | | | 26 | | | 9 | | | | 5 | 67 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 56 | | | 38 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 16 | | | 16 | | | 31 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 23 | | | 31 | | | 44 | | | | 5 | 77 |
| MUL | 42 | | | 25 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 30 | | | 33 | | | 31 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 25 | | | 26 | | | 30 | | | | 5 | 67 |

| 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 | 39 | 53 | 53 | 50 | 63 | 44 | 57 | | | | | 68 |
| SWD | 18 | 42 | 57 | 28 | 41 | 33 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 34 | 52 | | 51 | 65 | | 55 | | | | | 68 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 69 | 80 | | 69 | 90 | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| BLK | 16 | 41 | 33 | 20 | 43 | 25 | 38 | | | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 54 | | 52 | 59 | 50 | 50 | | | | | 63 |
| MUL | 50 | | | 64 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | 58 | 64 | 60 | 71 | | 65 | | | | | |
| FRL | 34 | 49 | 46 | 40 | 62 | 48 | 53 | | | | | 68 |

| 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 | 38 | 47 | 50 | 41 | 35 | 39 | 38 | | | | | 89 |
| SWD | 11 | 28 | 42 | 18 | 38 | 36 | 16 | | | | | |
| ELL | 36 | 55 | | 43 | 26 | | 37 | | | | | 89 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 63 | | | 74 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 53 | | 27 | 40 | | 33 | | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 63 | | 40 | 31 | | 47 | | | | | 88 |
| MUL | 25 | | | 25 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 36 | 37 | 36 | 44 | 30 | | 39 | | | | | 83 |
| FRL | 35 | 41 | 41 | 35 | 27 | 29 | 40 | | | | | 83 |

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.

| Grade | Year | ELA | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| | | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 57% | -19% | 54% | -16% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 58% | -26% | 58% | -26% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 27% | 53% | -26% | 50% | -23% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 20% | 62% | -42% | 59% | -39% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 66% | -28% | 61% | -23% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 33% | 61% | -28% | 55% | -22% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 35% | 60% | -25% | 51% | -16% |

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.

The data components showed that the lowest performance was in the SWD and African American students. Lack of individualized support and instruction.

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

The data components showed that the largest decline in performance was in the African American student subgroup. Lack of individualized support and instruction.

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.

NA

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

The MLT subgroup showed the most improvement. Student supports were implemented and this is a small subgroup.

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

Math is a concern, much lower than ELA; Large number of students with 2 or more early warning indicators particularly 2nd (39); 3rd (42); 5th (41).

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

1. Targeted small group instruction to support individualized instruction.
2. Data and progress monitoring (staff and students)
3. Strengthen planning to impact instruction (clarity) to support individualized instruction.
4. Define the system and structures for school-wide management systems and incentive students.
5. Develop hyper focus on attendance to increase student achievement.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

There were a significant amount of students with 2 or more Early Warning Systems (171). Students' attendance and some academic lack was evident in ELA/Math. Additionally, student behaviors were shown to impact student learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student attendance will increase by 10% in all grade levels, as compared to the previous year. Student office-related referrals will decrease by 50% from the previous year.

Monitoring:

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

We will track attendance by grade, and report to the staff and students the weekly leaders. Discipline data will be monitored weekly during Student Services Meetings. All data is shared with staff weekly and monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carmen Harris (harriscar@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.)

We will conduct weekly leader call-out and incentive classes and grades that lead in attendance, weekly, monthly and quarterly. We will implement the "Beat the Bell System"; We will connect with families through phone and home visits to support student attendance. We will implement Wacky Wednesday to celebrate student behavioral success. We will have student of the month and quarterly behavioral incentive. We will have the PBIS store for students to spend their earned dollars.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Motivation for students to attend school and incentive students for making positive behavioral choices.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**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.

There was a drop in subgroup performance in both ELA and Math instruction, significant in 2 groups in particular. Lack of individual focus and meeting needs, contributes to large gaps in learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student data will increase by 10% from the previous year in proficiency and by 20% in gains, compared to 21-22 gains.

Monitoring:

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

Data Analysis meetings, PLC and Academic Services Team Meeting, Walk throughs, Look-fors and trend data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carmen Harris (harriscar@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.)

Small Group Instruction in both ELA and Math, Planning sessions, Professional development (weekly); Coaching cycles, Fishbowls for exemplar experiences, support groups

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Best practice shown to support student learning with a more targeted focus and supports, yield a greater outcomes.

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.

Training for staff on Small Group
Weekly planning supports
Coaching Cycle on Small Group (seeing exemplar)
Fishbowls
Walk throughs for trends/look-fors

Person Responsible: Carmen Harris (harriscar@pcsb.org)

By When: QTR 1

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)).

Pinellas County Schools Superintendent and the Pinellas County School Board have invested in a strong support structure that creates an increasing number of strategies and interventions to support schools in need. The district has robust systems, processes, and measures to continually review the progress in the schools in support of their continued improvement. Data review has informed the various aspects of this plan. It connects several ongoing monitoring systems to support the schools in alignment with the domains for school turnaround: Effective Leadership, Collaborative Teaching, Ambitious Instruction and Learning, Safe and Supportive Environment, and Family and Community Engagement. The Leadership Team will continue to meet weekly to monitor the progress of our Differentiated Accountability (DA) schools. Issues identified in the process include but are not limited to the following: teacher concerns, staffing model, technology, facilities, instructional practices, the effectiveness of School-based Leadership Teams, coaching support model, allocation of resources, progress monitoring, and student performance. The team evaluates identified issues weekly and establishes a plan of action to resolve them effectively and efficiently.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

We will focus on small group instruction that will support differentiated learning levels and support, provide adequate resources and provide professional development and strategies to increase student achievement.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

We will focus on small group instruction that will support differentiated learning levels and support, provide adequate resources and provide professional development and strategies to increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Students in subgroups less than 40% will increase by 10% by the year's end.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Students in subgroups less than 40% will increase by 10% by the year's end.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Area of Focus will be monitored by the Academic Services Team and Administration, through walk-throughs, feedback cycles and observations.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Harris, Carmen, harriscar@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Professional Development
Feedback
Coaching Cycles

Modeling Exemplars
 Fishbowls
 Planning and Preparation
 Book Studies

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

These research based practices will help to enhance the small group experience and provide support for teachers as they work with students.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Prepare location/environment for small group. This includes, groups determine, routines and procedures and behavioral expectations that will support small groups. | Harris, Carmen, harriscar@pcsb.org |
| -Provide Coaching on effective implementation of small groups | Harris, Carmen, harriscar@pcsb.org |
| -Create Fishbowl experiences for teams to observe effective small groups | Harris, Carmen, harriscar@pcsb.org |
| -Monitor the fidelity of implementation | Harris, Carmen, harriscar@pcsb.org |

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

We will host a parent meeting and share with parents, after sharing with the SAC committee as well. Posting and documents will be placed on the school's website, sent home through Peachjar (distribution) and a text link provided for parents to access the information.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We will have monthly in-person Mom's Meetings and Dad meetings where we will participate in activities and share learning opportunities. We will create forums to

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The school will create a school-wide focus on small group so that student needs are met. We will provide a solid framework for the instructional block and monitor the effectiveness of time through walk-thrus and monitoring schedules.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No