Phillippi Shores Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Phillippi Shores Elementary School

4747 S TAMIAMI TRL, Sarasota, FL 34231

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/phillippi

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.

The family of Phillippi Shores Elementary School strives to grow inward, outward, and upward as we inquire, think, communicate, and take creative risks to ensure high levels of learning for all students through shared responsibility and parent engagement .

Provide the school's vision statement.

Phillippi Shores Elementary School has a universal vision of continually improving the quality of learning opportunities for students. Students develop academically, emotionally, and physically to their highest potential in an environment that is stimulating, caring, and supportive. Constructed on a foundation of trust, respect, and high expectations, our students become knowledgeable, principled, caring, open-minded, and well-balanced. Family engagement is a shared responsibility. The collaborative effort of parents and staff encourages high quality instruction for all learners and enables each student to strive for excellence, to build a positive self-image, and to develop a love for learning.

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
Staley, Holly	Principal	The Principal of Phillippi Shores IB World School serves as the instructional leader for the school, which includes creating a leadership team comprised of teachers representing each grade level and department within the school. The team meets twice a month to discuss academic and procedural topics, distinct process for the Children At Risk in Education (CARE) eligibility determination process. Additionally, the principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation to make sure adequate professional development is offered to support RtI implementation; communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities; and oversees building operational decisions. The principal also serves as the instructional leader for the administrative team which meets weekly to discuss academic and procedural topics related to the SIP, utilize the Sarasota County School Dashboard to analyze relevant school profile data for the purpose of problem analysis, review and revise RtI infrastructure already established, analyze data in order to identify trends and groups in need of more intervention, and establish programs and support for students and staff.
Achille, Lisa	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal works directly with the principal to provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making; ensure that the school-based team is implementing RtI; ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation to make sure adequate professional development is offered to support RtI implementation; communicate with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities, and oversee building operational decisions. The assistant principal also serves as an instructional leader on the administrative team, which meets weekly to discuss academic and procedural topics related to the SIP, utilize the Sarasota County School Dashboard to analyze relevant school profile data for the purpose of problem analysis, review and revise RtI infrastructure already established, analyze data in order to identify trends and groups in need of more intervention, and establish programs and support for students and staff.
Trapani, Suzette	Other	• FAST Coordinator (Testing Schedule, Accommodations, etc.) • Student awards & recognition activities • IB Newsletter & All Things IB • Technology Programs – IXL, My SCS, Benchmark Advance, Dreambox, etc. • Digital Communications– Marquee, etc. • PSNN • Professional Development System • Identify training and PD needs • Plan a parent night for Testing Info session w/ ESE liaison • 5K
Quinn, Tonya	Reading Coach	• Support literacy instruction across all content areas • Literacy leadership team leader • Provide Professional Development in the major reading components and data

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		analysis • Model effective instructional strategies for teachers in whole and small group • Collect and use data on instructional practices to inform and implement PD • Train teachers to administer assessments and analyze data to differentiate instruction • Coach and mentor teachers daily • Ensure science of reading programs and strategies are implemented with fidelity • Participate in job-embedded Literacy Coach Endorsement Coursework • Oversee the identification of students with a substantial reading deficiency and progress monitoring of those students • Collaborative problem solving to plan interventions
Pitts, Danielle	Other	The ESE Liaison serves on the the School Leadership Team of Phillippi Shores IB World School and the administrative team. The administrative team meets weekly with the principal and assistant principal to discuss academic and procedural topics, implement the SIP, and facilitate PBS/RtI as a related, but distinct process from the Children At Risk in Education (CARE) eligibility determination process. Every member of the team has an equal voice and decisions are made through consensus and data driven decision making.
Ramsden, Angie	Behavior Specialist	• Behavior Calls (1st Response) • TPS Data • PBIS Assemblies • Zones of Regulation refresher/implementation • SWST/CARE meetings as needed • Classroom Management support to teachers • Check- In/ Check-Out • Behavior Interventions, Restorative Circles • Behavior Call Log
Paine, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher- Represents Kindergarten: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/ instruction with tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Zamikoff, Shana	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher- Represents First Grade: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/ instruction with tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Seace, Candice	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher- Represents Second Grade: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/ instruction with tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Marsh, Jill	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher- Represents Third Grade: provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/ instruction with tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Lund, Amy	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher- Represents Fourth provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; provides Tier 1 instruction and Tier2/3 interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; integrates Tier 1 materials/ instruction with tier 2/3 activities. Additionally, the grade level leader serves as a case manager that has vast experience in the intervention process and support them in the research-based lessons dependent on the level of student need (e.g. size of instructional group, duration of intervention, and length of sessions).
Bocock, Michelle	School Counselor	• CAARS • 504 Coordinator's Assistant • FBAs/BIPs (RTI – students in process) • MTSS/RTI Behavior Interventions • Middle School Articulation Meetings • Families in Need Coordinator (Day of Hope, Holiday Shopping) • Outside Agency Contact (DCF, etc.) • Crisis/Behavior Intervention • Individual/Group/Classroom Guidance • School-Wide Guidance (PSNN & Schoology) • Uniform Compliance/Clothes Closet • All Faiths Food Bank Backpack Program • Discipline Paperwork (Restraint, Bullying, Safety Plans) • Falcon Nest Store • School wide activities/ PBIS assemblies

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.

The SIP is developed with input from the school leadership team. Meeting monthly with stakeholders through SAC, PTO, and SDMT meetings we discuss progress toward school improvement plan goals. This is a vital and structured process that promotes collaboration and transparency. These regular gatherings bring together key individuals, including teachers, administrators, parents, and community members, to evaluate the implementation of the school improvement plan. During these meetings, participants review data, share insights, and exchange ideas to assess the effectiveness of the strategies and initiatives outlined in the plan. By engaging in open dialogue and addressing any challenges or adjustments needed, these sessions ensure that the school remains on track to achieve its improvement objectives. The frequency of these meetings allows for continuous refinement and alignment of efforts, ultimately fostering a cohesive and results-driven approach to enhancing the educational experience for students and promoting overall school success.

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 school improvement plan's effectiveness will be systematically monitored through a multifaceted approach, aimed at providing comprehensive insights into its impact. State assessment data will be meticulously analyzed to gauge student performance and identify areas of improvement. Additionally, collaborative efforts will be made to design common formative assessments that align with the plan's goals, allowing educators to consistently track student progress and tailor instruction accordingly. Regular progress monitoring will be conducted, with data reviewed during weekly team meetings to assess the plan's implementation and outcomes. This iterative feedback loop ensures that any necessary adjustments are promptly identified and incorporated into the school improvement plan. By utilizing this process, the school remains responsive, maximizing its potential to cultivate an environment of continuous growth and educational excellence.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	40%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification	N/A

*updated as of 3/11/2024	
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) 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	7	23	12	15	6	18	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	12
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	11	16	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	7	14	0	0	0	23
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	

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	4	0	2	26	6	28	0	0	66

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	6	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	7	24	14	17	17	17	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	1	1	4	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	2	1	6	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	3	0	9	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	9	11	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	7	9	0	0	0	20
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	5	3	8	10	12	23	0	0	0	61

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	12	8	16	5	0	0	0	0	0	41
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	7	24	14	17	17	17	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	1	1	4	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	2	1	6	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	3	0	9	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	9	11	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	7	9	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	5	0	2	72	54	0	0	0	139

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	5	3	8	10	12	23	0	0	0	61

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	14
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*	73	65	53	78	66	56	80		
ELA Learning Gains				70			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			53		
Math Achievement*	77	68	59	80	52	50	78		
Math Learning Gains				69			70		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			45		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	67	69	54	66	67	59	74		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					60	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	69	68	59	65			90		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	535
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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	68			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	57			

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	41			
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	59			
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	58			

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	73			77			67					69
SWD	46			47			17				4	
ELL	60			55			50				5	69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			43			27				3	
HSP	68			72			65				5	62
MUL	60			80							2	
PAC												
WHT	79			83			76				4	
FRL	60			64			45				5	60

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	78	70	53	80	69	54	66					65
SWD	46	49	38	48	47	35	22					
ELL	62	58	50	67	58	46	56					65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48	66	61	46	59	59	21					
HSP	70	59	44	71	56	47	58					63
MUL	86	80		93	80							
PAC												
WHT	86	74	48	88	73	52	76					
FRL	64	63	55	66	59	51	47					

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	80	65	53	78	70	45	74					90
SWD	48	46	33	54	52	38	32					
ELL	82	50		74	80							90

						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**
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	39	30	36	59	60	21					
HSP	78	63	50	71	71		63					89
MUL	71			76								
PAC												
WHT	90	72	73	87	73	36	84					
FRL	69	61	50	65	67	65	60					

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	72%	67%	5%	54%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	67%	11%	58%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	61%	10%	50%	21%

				MATH		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2023 - Spring	78%	70%	8%	59%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	70%	8%	61%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	77%	66%	11%	55%	22%

				SCIENCE		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2023 - Spring	67%	67%	0%	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.

Based on the previous data from the 2022-2023 school year, we saw a decrease from 78% to 74% in ELA Proficiency rates. Specifically, there was a decrease in grades 3 and 5 ELA proficiency scores and an increase in grade 4. The biggest drop was in grade 5 ELA from 77% to 72%.

For math, there was a decrease in proficiency scores from 79% to 78%. In grade 3, proficiency decreased from 85% to 78% and from 82% to 78% in grade 4. Grade 5 rates increased from 71% to 77%.

Phillippi Shores outperformed both the state and the district in the areas of ELA, Math and Science.

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

Grade 3 ELA scores declined from 80% to 71%. Although, this is higher than both the state (50%) and district (61%) proficiency levels, we recognize that there is work to be done. Several factors may have contributed to this decline; computer-based testing in a lab, this cohort was greatly impacted by COVID at the start of their school career, teachers needed to fill gaps in the areas of phonics. This is not typically an area third grade teachers focus on so they were learning as they were filling these gaps.

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.

Phillippi Shores outperformed both the state and the district in the areas of ELA, Math and Science. Trends show that we outperform both the district and state annually.

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

We saw the greatest improvement in our grade 5 Math scores with an increase from 71% to 77%. The grade 5 team implemented the PLC process to analyze data and plan instruction. They shared students during intervention blocks of time to best meet student needs. Other contributing factors included highly effective teaching, spiral review, mentoring, in class support from administration, tutoring, participation of some teachers in the Numeracy Project, and the use of IXL. Continued implementation of the strategies and tools from the Instructional focus guide (IFG) also contributed. The implementation of Dreambox, McGraw Hill Reveal Math curriculum, PD in mathematical practices and new standards also supported this increase.

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

1. Attendance is an area of concern. Although it is a small percentage of students the students miss 10% or more of school.
2. The number of Level 1s on statewide assessments (ELA assessment (24) and Math assessment (20)).

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

1. Implementation of PLC process to analyze data and plan instruction within grade level teams.
2. Increase in % of proficient students in ELA and Math.
3. Increase in Science assessment scores.
4. Implementation of attendance interventions.

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.

Early warning system indicators showed a significant increase in students with two or more indicators and suspensions. When students are not in school, learning rarely occurs. Therefore, decreasing the number of behavior incidents that result in suspensions, as well as increasing student/ family involvement to increase attendance and academic performance are vital to improving student learning.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, there will be a 2% reduction in the number of students who receive one or more suspensions and a 5% reduction in the number of students who have two or more early warning system indicators.

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

We will monitor behavioral referrals and utilize classroom calming zones, reflection room, parent conferences, and restorative practices as alternatives to suspension when appropriate. Behavior and attendance data will be collected and reviewed regularly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Staley (holly.staley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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.)

Phillippi Shores will continue to be a part of the Advancing Classroom Climate in Sarasota Schools (ACCISS), which provides a pathway for the district to to enhance and expand the implementation of PBIS and MTSS with fidelity resulting in an increase in the number of schools with an improved school climate. Additionally, CHAMPS: A Proactive and Positive Approach to Classroom, Character Strong, and Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) will continue to be implemented in all areas of the Phillippi Shores Elementary campus.

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

The ACCISS grant has three major objectives that when implemented will result in a decrease in suspensions and students with two or more indicators. These include improving the MTSS/PBIS process by using a tiered approach to build the capacity of classroom teachers, and support staff including behavior specialist, counselors, social workers, school psychologists, ESE district and school-based liaisons to implement a sustained, school-wide multi tiered academic and behavioral framework, developing sustainability processes during implementation to ensure continued MTSS and PBIS implementation and student progress after the project ends, and partnering with the PBIS Technical Assistance Center to provide expert technical assistance related to implementing program activities. Additionally CHAMPS: A Proactive and Positive Approach to Classroom and PBIS have both shown that full implementation will reduce absenteeism, the number of office referrals that lead to suspension, and improve classroom/school climate.

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.

1. Staff and the PBIS team will work closely with the ACCISS grant support team to increase PBIS training for the Phillippi team and implement strategies and tools provided. 2. With the grant, a full time support staff member will receive professional development as a behavior technician and will work with the school based behavior team, which includes an additional aide, school counselor, full time school based mental health therapist, and administrative team. 3. Behavior support team will meet weekly to review referral data, problem solve, and discuss interventions. 4. Incentive programs for catching students making positive choices and/or improving behavior (Falcon dollars, Cafeteria Blooming Chart, IB STARR Awards, Student of the Month, and Bus Bucks) 5. Visibility and use of CHAMPS in every classroom and common areas on campus. 6. Continued use of restorative practices by classroom teachers, behavior specialist, and school counselor. 7. Implementation of Resiliency Education.

Person Responsible: Lisa Achille (lisa.achille@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly

#2. 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.

Area of focus in ELA is to decrease the number of 1s and 2s on FAST assessments in all grade levels. We currently have 29% of our third graders not meeting proficiency, 22% of fourth graders and 28% of fifth graders not meeting proficiency on ELA FAST assessments.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, at least 80% of students will meet proficiency in ELA as measured by FAST.

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

Analysis of progress monitoring data, iReady, and FAST assessment data through the PLC process and conducting classroom walk throughs to support teacher's instruction. The Literacy Coach will lead our Literacy Leadership team and help provide professional development in the Science of Reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Staley (holly.staley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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.)

Explicit instruction involves teaching a specific skill or concept in a highly structured manner. During explicit instruction, the teacher clearly identifies the expectations for learning and provides the success criteria to provide students with exact expectations for performance.

Teachers will refer to the decision tree provided by the district to guide the selection of interventions.

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

Explicit instruction, clarity, learning intentions, and success criteria are high yield strategies as measured through John Hattie's work in Visible Learning, as well as Marzano's work in Classroom Instruction That Works. By providing students with clear expectations for learning, guess work, assumptions, and incorrect attempts at the content are decreased, and student opportunity for success and growth increase.

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.

1. Professional development in UFLI by the literacy coach.
2. ELA teachers will continue to participate in discussions focused on learning intentions, success criteria, small group instruction, and the ELA decision tree through the PLC process.

3. Teachers will implement strategies and tools from the Instructional Focus Guides (IFG).
4. Students in the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 will attend Falcon Academy.
5. An intervention block has been put in the schedule at every grade level.
6. Continue to implement Benchmark, iReady, and Accelerated Reader in class.
7. Using data from Common Formative assessments on grade level standards, teachers will group students to work with during intervention blocks.
6. Establish a literacy leadership team and conduct weekly walk throughs to monitor implementation of ELA best practices and provide support.

Person Responsible: Holly Staley (holly.staley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

#3. 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.

There was an increase in grade 5 math scores from 71% to 77%. Both grade 3 and grade 4 saw a decrease in scores, therefore, the area of focus in math is to increase the percentage of students proficient on the FAST assessment in grades 3-5.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, at least 80% of students will demonstrate proficiency in math as measured by FAST.

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

This will be monitored through analyzing progress monitoring data, common formative assessments, and FAST assessment data, in addition to conducting math walk throughs to support instructional practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Staley (holly.staley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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.)

Explicit instruction involves teaching a specific skill or concept in a highly structured manner. During explicit instruction, the teacher clearly identifies the expectations for learning and provides the success criteria to provide students with exact expectations for performance.

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

Explicit instruction, clarity, learning intentions, and success criteria are high yield strategies as measured through John Hattie's work in Visible Learning, as well as Marzano's work in Classroom Instruction That Works. By providing students with clear expectations for learning, guess work, assumptions, and incorrect attempts at the content are decreased, and student opportunity for success and growth increase.

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.

1. Spiral review of math skills will be a part of every lesson.
2. Teachers will utilize Reveal Math, align lessons to standards, continue formative assessment, and progress monitoring for all students.
3. Students in grades 3-5 can attend Falcon Academy.
4. Clear learning intentions and success criteria are shared/ posted for lessons.

5. Math is departmentalized for grades 4 & 5.

6. Math walkthroughs will be conducted to monitor instructional practices and provide support.

Person Responsible: Holly Staley (holly.staley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

#4. 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.

An area of focus is Science proficiency on the grade 5 assessment. We are at 67%, an increase from 66%.

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

By the end of 2023-2024 school year, 75% of grade 5 students will meet proficiency as measured by the state assessment (NGSSS).

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

Science benchmark data, common formative assessments, and classroom observations will be use to monitor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Staley (holly.staley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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.)

Explicit instruction involves teaching a specific skill or concept in a highly structured manner. During explicit instruction, the teacher clearly identifies the expectations for learning and provides the success criteria to provide students with exact expectations for performance.

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

Explicit instruction, clarity, learning intentions, and success criteria are high yield strategies as measured through John Hattie's work in Visible Learning, as well as Marzano's work in Classroom Instruction That Works. By providing students with clear expectations for learning, guess work, assumptions, and incorrect attempts at the content are decreased, and student opportunity for success and growth increase.

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.

1. Creation of a science committee to analyze data of benchmark assessments and identify gaps in the standards.
2. Teachers will continue to implement the district adopted science curriculum and meet weekly in CPT meetings for instructional planning, curriculum development, and evaluation.
3. Clear learning intentions and success criteria are shared/posted for lessons.
4. All students will attend STEM on the specials wheel for additional concept reinforcement and lab work.
5. Fifth grade students are departmentalized.

Person Responsible: Holly Staley (holly.staley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

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.

To increase proficiency and learning gains in all areas, professional learning communities will be implemented.

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

All grade level teams will use common planning time to analyze data, determine student needs, and plan instruction accordingly.

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

There will be a Focus on Learning, Focus on Collaboration, Focus on Results.
PLCs will be monitored by members of the guiding coalition and team leaders. Notes from each meeting will be recorded and submitted to the admin team. The literacy coach will attend common planning time and be a member of each grade level PLC.
Data Driven Decision Making using the PLC Process
The fundamental purpose of the school is to ensure high levels of learning for all students.
This focus on learning translates into four critical questions that drive the daily work of the school. In PLCs, educators demonstrate their commitment to helping all students learn by working collaboratively to address the following critical questions:
1) What do we want students to learn? What should each student know and be able to do as a result of each

unit, grade level, and/or course?
2) How will we know if they have learned? Are we monitoring each student's learning on a timely basis?
3) What will we do if they don't learn? What systematic process is in place to provide additional time and support for students who are experiencing difficulty?
4) What will we do if they already know it?

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Staley (holly.staley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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.)

Implementation of the PLC process across all grade levels through building a collaborative culture, and have a focus on results, and focus on learning.

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

No school can help all students achieve at high levels if teachers work in isolation. Schools improve when teachers are given the time and support to work together to clarify essential student learning, develop CFAs for learning, analyze evidence of student learning, and use that evidence to learn from one another. PLCs measure their effectiveness on the basis of results rather than intentions. Focus on results- PLCS measure their effectiveness on the basis of results, rather than intentions.
• All programs, policies, and practices are continually assessed on the basis of their impact on student learning.
• All staff members receive relevant and timely information on their effectiveness in achieving intended results.

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.

• Assess the needs, strengths, progress, and performance of students
• Develop and revise classroom instruction
• Understand professional strengths and weaknesses
Administrators will:
• Assess the needs, strengths, progress, and performance of staff and students
• Develop and revise school plans, targets, and goals
• Monitor the implementation and impact of school practices, programs, and policies

Person Responsible: Holly Staley (holly.staley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024