
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	28
Budget to Support Goals	28

Cross Bayou Elementary School

6886 102ND AVE N, Pinellas Park, FL 33782

<http://www.crossbayou-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Antonette Wilson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	28

Cross Bayou Elementary School

6886 102ND AVE N, Pinellas Park, FL 33782

<http://www.crossbayou-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Cross Bayou Elementary will provide a caring and success oriented learning environment that enable each child to become a respectful, responsible and motivated lifetime learner through a collaborative effort among students, staff and the community.

Our School Motto that students can say that supports our school mission is:

C - Come Prepared

B - Be Responsible

E - Exhibit Kindness

S - Show Respect

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success. All students will make a least 1 year of academic growth per year.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wickett, Katherine	Principal	Creates agenda and leads discussions
Stull, Eileen	Assistant Principal	Leads discussions and documents meeting content
Giammarco, Denise	Teacher, K-12	K team leader
Caldea, Vivian	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade Team Leader
Jones, Lynette	Teacher, K-12	4th grade Team Leader and Math Lead
Rouse, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	5th grade Team Leader and ELA Lead
Kuespert, Amy	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team Leader, note taker and SWD Lead
Brillant, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	1st grade Team Leader
Fulmer, Meagan	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade Team Leader and Science Lead
Chrosniak, Jessica	School Counselor	School Counselor and BTG Lead
Fairman, Linda	Teacher, K-12	Specialists Team Leader and Time Keeper
Curzio-Blake, Lisa	School Counselor	School Counselor and IIRP
Scheidt, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Wellness Champion
Craig-Langes, Christine	Psychologist	Data Sharing
Hernandez, Ariel	Attendance/Social Work	Data Sharing

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Antonette Wilson

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

0

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

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	47	58	63	65	61	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	365
Attendance below 90 percent	1	15	23	17	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/1/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	42	67	68	66	65	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	13	12	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	5	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Students with two or more indicators	0	2	0	5	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Number of students enrolled	42	67	68	66	65	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	13	12	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
-----------------------------	---	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	5	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
-------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Students with two or more indicators	0	2	0	5	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	38%	54%	57%	42%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	59%	58%	55%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	54%	53%	65%	47%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	53%	61%	63%	57%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	61%	62%	63%	61%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	48%	51%	47%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	53%	53%	44%	53%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	31%	56%	-25%	58%	-27%
	2018	52%	53%	-1%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	56%	-8%	58%	-10%
	2018	30%	51%	-21%	56%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	33%	54%	-21%	56%	-23%
	2018	41%	50%	-9%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%
	2018	55%	62%	-7%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	64%	-1%	64%	-1%
	2018	54%	62%	-8%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	46%	60%	-14%	60%	-14%
	2018	57%	61%	-4%	61%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison				-11%		
Cohort Comparison				-8%		

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	54%	-15%	53%	-14%
	2018	58%	57%	1%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison				-19%		
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	24	17	31	31	36	7				
ELL	36	74		64	32		18				
ASN	57	73		81	45						
BLK	22	30		32	43	30	8				
HSP	26	73	70	37	27		25				
WHT	40	62	50	55	57	35	43				
FRL	28	57	57	46	46	25	31				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	33	50	24	46	44	17				
ELL	33	50		54	56						
ASN	69	75		81	75						
BLK	27	29		48	43						
HSP	31	33		44	52						
WHT	41	40	47	55	58	44	56				
FRL	37	39	46	50	56	41	54				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	14	52	73	25	40	38					
ELL	21	45	58	59	70		10				
ASN	52	65		78	75		55				
BLK	43	57		48	60						
HSP	32	57		55	57		36				
WHT	41	50	62	52	61	40	45				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
FRL	39	57	64	52	56	41	40				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	398
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	68
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	49
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our Math Learning Gains for our L25 students show the lowest performance. We saw a significant drop from 2018 to 2019. When analyzing students in the L25 who did not make learning gains, we noted that 55% of those students increased their scale score in math, but not enough to make a

learning gain. Reading levels of these students affected their ability to read the math problems and know how to breakdown the problems. **Need to add info on the current 5th graders (without ly 5th graders)

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

Our Science scores showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019. Our 5th grade students only had 33% reading at level 3 or above, which impacted their ability to read the on grade level Science Assessment.

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.

3rd grade ELA proficiency showed the greatest gap when compared to the state. Our score for 3rd grade proficiency was 31% compared to the state proficiency of 58%, which is a 27% gap. We had a teacher go on leave at the beginning of the school year, so we had a long term sub start the year. We had her and other subs until we were able to hire a new teacher at the end of October.

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

Our ELA Learning Gains showed the greatest increase at 20%. The utilization of Jan Richardson Guided Reading in intermediate grades was a contributing factor as well as having Title 1 funds to have hourly teachers able to work with intermediate students in the 18/19 school year. Monitoring L25 students in reading and putting plans in place to monitor all Level 1 and Level 2 students. Student goal setting was also a positive factor.

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

Level 1 on statewide Assessment (41 students) and Attendance below 90% (85 students)

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Science Proficiency
3. ELA Learning Gains
4. Math Learning Gains for L25
5. ESSA subgroups of SWD and AA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Our current level of proficiency is 38% as evidenced by the 2019 ELA FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because the core instruction needs to be mapped out consistently in each grade level and followed to fidelity.

Measurable Outcome: The number of students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 38% to 48% or higher as measured by the 2021 ELA FSA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion and writing with feedback. The most important component of the literacy block is ensuring ample time is given to student to read and write appropriate grade-level text (while applying foundational skills) with high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We are not seeing 80% of our students achieving mastery through core instruction. Teachers need to plan for more student involvement in their own learning. This includes using instructional methods that allow for more student inquiry, implement 6M's strategies and Culturally Responsive Teaching strategies into lessons.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide TDE's for teachers to collaborate on ELA modules and determining instructional strategies that will support high student engagement.
2. Conduct monthly PD/PLC's that focus on instructional methods, 6M's and Culturally Responsive Teaching Strategies by co-planning and co facilitating with ELA Champions around standards based instruction to address core instruction. Study student work and plan for small group instruction.
3. Administrators to collect data on engagement rate of students target/task alignment during walkthroughs and share trends with staff.
4. Teachers to engage in PD on technology resources, including Canvas Learning Management System, Newsela and Nearpod.

Person Responsible: Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

1. Teachers align DPP's to focus on Conditions for Learning that impact instruction.
2. Review OPM data weekly with Resource teachers to plan for changes as needed.

Person Responsible: Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

1. Primary teachers (K-2) to participate in and implement strategies from the book study "Equipped for Reading Success - One Minute Drills"

Person Responsible: Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

1. Use Inclusion Model for ESE instruction in grades 4 and 5.

Person Responsible: Stacy Rouse (rouses@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Our current level of proficiency is 53% as evidenced by the 2019 Math FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because the core instruction needs to have an increase in problem solving strategies.

Measurable Outcome: The number of students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 53% to 63% or higher as measured by the 2021 Math FSA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Empower mathematics teacher leaders to create and sustain a culture of feedback and openness, including ongoing teacher to teacher feedback, learning walks, etc. For example, using the Coached Observation Protocol.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers need to have a strong understanding of the math content they are teaching before they can teach it effectively. Making Sense of Mathematics allows teachers to gain that mathematical content knowledge before teaching the concepts. Our Math Cohort will be leading training and facilitating classroom observations and debriefings.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure all classrooms have adequate manipulatives for student use in math lessons.
2. Administrators will monitor effective implementation of Ready Mathematics and Dreambox Learning.
3. Teachers will use the 5 question pre-requisite assessment prior to each unit and use the results for planning math instruction. Administrators will monitor the assessment data.

Person Responsible Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

1. Math Cohort will develop a PD plan for the year.
- 2 Teachers to participate in math PD provided by our CBE Math Cohort.

Person Responsible Lynette Jones (jonesly@pcsb.org)

1. Provide TDE's for teachers to collaboratively plan out rich problem-solving math lessons.
2. Provide coverage for teachers to visit other classrooms to observe effective math lessons and /or develop virtual observation or taped lesson opportunities.
3. Teachers to participate in PD for Dreambox.

Person Responsible Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Our current level of proficiency is 39% as evidenced by the 2019 Science FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because the core instruction needs to have the 10-70-20 science instructional model consistently implemented.

Measurable Outcome: The number of students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 39% to 55% or higher as measured by the 2021 Science FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilize systemic document to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 10-70-20 science instructional model (10% setting the purpose, 70% core science, 20% confirming the learning) and include appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignment to the 1st-5th grade standards.

Support and utilize formal and informal assessment strategies that inform instruction. Identify proficiency levels and implement instructional strategies to increase conceptual development of key content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: All classrooms are not consistently using the 10-70-20 model. Students are not able to make predictions based on observational data and they need more experience conducting experiments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increase the number of Science Experiments in all grades during the year.
2. Administrators will monitor the use of the Science lab and the assessment data.
3. Utilize Science gaming programs/Science videos during lunch to reinforce concepts.

Person Responsible Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

1. Develop and implement the 5th grade plan at the beginning of the year to address the gaps of 3rd and 4th grade standards.
2. Teachers in 5th grade will focus on developing a plan to address the 4th grade Life Science standards.

Person Responsible Stacy Rouse (rouses@pcsb.org)

1. Teachers to participate in Science PD during PLC's and Curriculum meetings
2. Administrators will review lesson plans for the 10-70-20 model and will follow up with walk-throughs in classrooms to ensure this model is being utilized consistently.
3. Purchase Science Vocabulary Posters to use in common areas to promote science discussions.

Person Responsible Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

#4. Other specifically relating to Bridging the Gap

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our current level of reading proficiency for black students is 27% as evidenced by the 2019 ELA FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because these students do not have enough texts that they can relate to and teachers have not been consistently using Culturally Responsive Strategies.

Measurable Outcome: The number of black students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 27% to 41% or higher as measured by the 2021 ELA FSA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Consistently implement Culturally Responsive Strategies and the 6 M's strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our black students are not connecting to the instruction and teachers need to be more aware of this disconnect and identify strategies to help students connect to instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide ongoing PD and support on implementing Culturally Relevant Strategies, Restorative Practices and the 6 M's in classroom instruction.
2. Teachers will engage in equity centered PD provided at PLC and PD Meetings using articles that address equitable grading, bias and supporting students SEL as they transition back to school.
3. Teachers will engage in Title 1 training on bias.

Person Responsible Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

1. Provide more leadership roles for our black students.
2. Monitor the academic growth of our black students:
 First month - Teachers will pull previous data on black students to develop a plan for each black student for academic and SEL support.
 Second month - Teachers will utilize Cycle 1 Assessment data to revise plan and set goals with the students.
 Third month - Teachers will revisit goals and revise as needed with the students.
 This same process will continue each quarter.
3. Teachers will communicate their plan of action and progress to Administrators.

Person Responsible Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our current level of ELA proficiency for our SWD is 23% as evidenced by the 2019 ELA FSA. Our current level of Math proficiency for our SWD students is 24% as evidenced by the 2019 Math FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because these students need more intensive instruction within their own classrooms.

Measurable Outcome: The number of SWD students scoring Level 3 or higher in ELA will increase from 23% to 41% or higher as measured by the 2021 ELA FSA. The number of SWD students scoring Level 3 or higher in Math will increase from 24% to 41% or higher as measured by the 2021 Math FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will benefit from inclusionary ESE support as they tackle grade level material.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: SWD students need scaffolded support in the general education classroom for cognitively complex tasks. This can be achieved using inclusionary practices.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement ESE Inclusion in our 4th and 5th grade classrooms.
2. Provide time for VE Resource teachers and Gen Ed teachers to collaborate on curriculum.

Person Responsible Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

1. Plan for the use of more manipulatives and visuals during instruction.
2. Monitor SWD student progress during weekly meeting with VE Resource teachers to adjust instruction to meet student needs.
3. Primary teachers (K-2) to participate in and implement strategies from the book study "Equipped for Success - One Minute Drills" to be able to diagnose student ELA deficits that they will need to address.

Person Responsible Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

#6. Other specifically relating to School Climate/Conditions for Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our current level of performance in regards to School Wide Behavior is 25 office referrals. Looking deeper at the discipline code data, our 2 highest reasons for ODR are Strike/Student (16 referrals - 64%) and Class/Campus disruption (5 referrals - 20%). These ODR's were for the first 3 grading periods of the 19/20 school year.

Measurable Outcome: The number of students receiving ODR under the category of Strike/Student will decrease from 16 to 10 or fewer as measured by the end of the 2021 school year School Profiles Report

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Use of PBIS framework and Restorative Practice strategies to build relationships in a family oriented culture of respect and to provide social/emotional support for students as they transition back into school within the school building.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We are concerned about the increase in students striking other students. With returning to school buildings, our staff will need to closely monitor students emotional state and support them using PBIS, Restorative Practices strategies and Equitable Practices.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review and reinforce School-Wide Processes.

Person Responsible Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

1. Brainstorm with staff how we will use RP, PBIS strategies and Equitable Practices to support our students when we return to our buildings.
2. Teach and review with students how to have informal RP conversations using affective statements and questions.
3. Review RP Circle Process with students and teachers will have a class circle at least once a week. This will be reflected in lesson plans.
4. Book Study on Better Than Carrots or Sticks with staff.

Person Responsible Lisa Curzio-Blake (curzio-blakel@pcsb.org)

1. Monitor types of referrals and share this data with staff and families each month.
2. PBIS team will meet monthly to respond to referral data and classroom concerns to determine ways to support students who are struggling with social/emotional or discipline issues.

Person Responsible Jessica Chrosniak (chrosniakj@pcsb.org)

#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our current attendance rate for the first 3 grading periods of the 19/20 school year was 91.9%, Our goal is to have an attendance rate of 95% or higher.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of students absent for 10% or more of the school year will decrease from 31% to 20% or less as evidenced by School Profiles.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using the PBIS framework to recognize students with on-time attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In the past 5 years our percentage of students missing 10% or more of school has increased from 17% to 31%. This has a negative impact on learning. We are adding incentives for students who are in attendance on time at school and will monitor through our Child Study Team.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor Student Absenteeism through the Child Study Team and make personal phone calls to parents regarding their student's attendance.
2. Administrators will have random drawings in classrooms of students who are in attendance.
3. Communicate our attendance goal to families.
4. Each quarter, the 3 classes with the highest attendance rate for the quarter will receive a popcorn party. This will be announced at the Bobcat Assembly.
5. Add signs at the car circle/patio to remind parents of school times.
6. Enforce a policy of no early release of students the last 30 minutes of the day.
7. Late arriving students must have their parents sign them into the office.

Person Responsible: Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

#8. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Our average attendance of families at school events is 50-60 families as measured by our sign in sheets. This is a participation rate of 15%.

Description and Rationale: For teachers to make personal connections with families, especially in light of COVID-19 disruption of school last year. Our goal is for teachers to increase the amount of communication with families through phone calls or emails.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of families participating in school events will increase from 15% to 25% or higher as measured by parent sign in sheets during the 20/21 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Have a monthly family event (in person or virtually) that provides strategies that parents can use to support student learning or give parents an opportunity to see their students perform. For in person events that are curriculum related, food will be provided using Title 1 funds. We will utilize events that are of interest to families such as Escape Rooms, Reading Camp, Math Games to attract more families to participate. We are also increasing parent communication with parents.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our student performances usually have a higher family participation then curriculum based events. By providing food and high interest activities, we are anticipating better participation.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Plan Monthly family involvement events (virtual or in person) to give parents strategies to help support their child's academic achievement.
2. Invite families to events via newsletter, phone class home and marquee messages.
3. Translate weekly phone/email to families about upcoming events in Spanish.
4. Translate written messages home in Spanish.

Person Responsible Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

1. Teachers will make 3:1 positive phone calls/emails to families to promote positive relationships.
2. Phone calls/emails will be recorded in the parent log in FOCUS.
3. Provide PD for teachers though Title 1 - Collaboration for Success - High Impact Classroom Family Engagement

Person Responsible Jessica Chrosniak (chrosniakj@pcsb.org)

#9. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of performance is 5 out of 6 modules in Alliance for Healthier Generation's Schools Program Assessment (Silver Level)
Measurable Outcome:	We expect our performance level to be 6 out of 6 modules by May 2021 as measured by the Alliance for Healthier Generations's Schools Program Assessment (Gold Level).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Recruit parents/community members to be part of our Healthy School Team to give us a broader perspective and to get input/resources outside of our school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When working on the Healthy Schools Program Assessment, there are areas to increase our score in modules by having parents/community members on our committee. We are looking for additional ways to involve parents in our school and this may be a way to involve some new parents.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assemble Healthy School Team.
2. Principal will personally invite parents/community members to be part of this team.
3. Complete the Healthy School Program Assessment.
4. Attend district-supported professional development.
5. Provide Health related activities for staff throughout the year.

Person Responsible Michael Scheidt (scheidtm@pcsb.org)

#10. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As a result of equity-centered problem solving withing the MTSS framework, our area of focus is to build relational capacity, empower student voice and hold high expectations through professional development and increasing the use of equitable practices (equitable grading, culturally relevant teaching and restorative practices).

We will measure progress by tracking the number of PD sessions and the number of teachers who attend PD. We expect at least 90% participation in all school level PD by May 2021.

Measurable Outcome: We expect the number of black students scoring Level 3 or higher in ELA will increase from 22% to 41% or higher as measured by the 2021 ELA FSA. We expect the number of black students scoring Level 3 or higher in Math will increase from 32% to 41% or higher as measured by the 2021 Math FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using the Racial Equity Analysis Protocol (REAP) to identify equitable practices in grading, culturally releveant teaching and restorative practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies and practices were identified using the Racial Equity Analysis Protocol (REAP)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a learning environment that reinforces a sense of social and academic belonging by using class meetings at least weekly to help students process issues and use problem solving strategies. Class meetings will be documented in lesson plans.
2. Ensure student's cultural and background experiences are valued and celebrated as an essential part of the classroom and school by using class discussions to incorporate multiple perspectives and incorporating a variety of cultures in our Arts performances/work.
3. Conduct Equity training at Monthly PD meeting and during PLC's focused on equitable grading and Bias each month.
4. Teachers will attend Title 1 PD on Bias at CBE.
5. Use Restorative Practice strategies with staff and student for problem solving.
6. We will measure long-term student outcomes by reducing the achievement gap.

Person Responsible Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

#11. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our current level of reading proficiency for black students is 27% as evidenced by the 2019 ELA FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because these students do not have enough texts that they can relate to and teachers have not been consistently using Culturally Responsive Strategies.

Measurable Outcome: The number of black students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 27% to 41% or higher as measured by the 2021 ELA FSA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Consistently implement Culturally Responsive Strategies and the 6 M's strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our black students are not connecting to the instruction and teachers need to be more aware of this disconnect and identify strategies to help students connect to instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide ongoing PD and support on implementing Culturally Relevant Strategies, Restorative Practices and the 6 M's in classroom instruction.
2. Teachers will engage in equity centered PD provided at PLC and PD Meetings using articles that address equitable grading, bias and supporting students SEL as they transition back to school.
3. Teachers will engage in Title 1 training on bias.
4. We will purchase additional texts that are or interest to our black students.

Person Responsible Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

1. Provide more leadership roles for our black students.
2. Monitor the academic growth of our black students:
 First month - Teachers will pull previous data on black students to develop a plan for each black student for academic and SEL support.
 Second month - Teachers will utilize Cycle 1 Assessment data to revise plan and set goals with the students.
 Third month - Teachers will revisit goals and revise as needed with the students.
 This same process will continue each quarter.
3. Teachers will communicate their plan of action and progress to Administrators.

Person Responsible Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our SBLT will be focusing on data for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to ensure that these students are showing positive responses to the interventions. We will ensure that in the classroom all students work with grade level materials with support on how to tackle this material.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Cross Bayou will hold a Family Gathering before school starts (this may be modified based on CDC requirements) to welcome families to CBE and make sure they know about our expectations.

We plan to host monthly parent events (following CDC guidelines).

We communicate with families through our daily agenda books (2 way communication), weekly phone message that includes school information for the upcoming week, weekly Communication Folder with Important School Information, quarterly newsletter and our website. All of our written communication (including the emails of the weekly phone message) is translated into Spanish.

We also have our Title 1 Annual Meeting in which we will share with parents our Title 1 plan, resources available and what it means to be a Title 1 School. This will include reviewing our Title 1 Compact which lays out expectations for students as well as what support teachers and parents will give to help all their students succeed.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$7,850.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	0811 - Cross Bayou Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,850.00

			<i>Notes: subs for TDE's</i>			
	5100	612-Library Books for Existing Libraries	0811 - Cross Bayou Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$5,000.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$2,850.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	0811 - Cross Bayou Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,850.00
			<i>Notes: subs for TDE's</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Bridging the Gap				\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: School Climate/Conditions for Learning				\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$0.00
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement				\$0.00
9	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools				\$0.00
10	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity				\$8,650.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0811 - Cross Bayou Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$7,000.00
			<i>Notes: Stipend pay for classroom teachers for training outside the contractual day.</i>			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0811 - Cross Bayou Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$250.00
			<i>Notes: Stipend pay for Non-Classroom Instructional Staff for training outside the contractual day.</i>			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0811 - Cross Bayou Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,400.00
			<i>Notes: Stipend pay for trainers for leading training outside the contractual day.</i>			
11	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American				\$0.00
					Total:	\$19,350.00