Seventy Fourth St. Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Seventy Fourth St. Elementary

3801 74TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33709

http://www.74th-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Cristen Ku

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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

Seventy Fourth St. Elementary

3801 74TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33709

http://www.74th-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 PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

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.

The mission of 74th Street Elementary is to set high expectations and celebrate student success in our community of learners to create an environment of maximum student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success.

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
Hathaway, Jessley	Principal	The role of the principal is to provide strategic direction in the school, develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement data, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.
Wyne, Kurt	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Ovalle, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Reading/MTSS coach
Brodney, Sandy	Instructional Coach	Math Coach
Goede , Caitlin	Teacher, K-12	Equity, 4th grade teacher
Bachnik, Jennifer	School Counselor	Conditions for learning-SEL
Patterson, Anna	Other	Conditions for learning-Behavior, Behavior Specialist
	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/22/2019, Cristen Ku

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

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	36	83	72	75	84	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	422
Attendance below 90 percent	0	30	31	27	28	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 7/16/2020

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	54	74	69	92	61	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	428
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	14	16	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	8	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	2	5	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	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	54	74	69	92	61	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	428
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	14	16	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	8	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	2	5	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	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	40%	54%	57%	43%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	59%	58%	48%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	54%	53%	45%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	43%	61%	63%	52%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	41%	61%	62%	48%	61%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	48%	51%	37%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	53%	53%	46%	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	34%	56%	-22%	58%	-24%
	2018	45%	53%	-8%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	56%	-4%	58%	-6%
	2018	42%	51%	-9%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
	2018	42%	50%	-8%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	37%	62%	-25%	62%	-25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-25%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	64%	-13%	64%	-13%
	2018	46%	62%	-16%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	45%	60%	-15%	60%	-15%
	2018	28%	61%	-33%	61%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	53%	-15%
	2018	35%	57%	-22%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	14	37	50	25	30	27					
ELL	26	44		43	36		21				
ASN	60	70		67	60						
BLK	24	52	40	32	28		23				
HSP	35	56	50	41	38		30				
MUL	67	50		57	50						
WHT	41	55	53	42	43	37	43				
FRL	38	56	55	39	37	36	38				
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	13	34	43	25	33	44	15				
ELL	28	52		49	33		31				
ASN	60			67							
BLK	36	33		47	40		14				
HSP	35	44	62	46	41	40	28				
MUL	47	42		42	8						
WHT	49	56	56	44	32	45	43				

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
FRL	44	49	46	41	33	39	29				

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	11	36	44	40	50	44	21				
ELL	25	38		69	57						
ASN	60			80							
BLK	44	50		43	46						
HSP	34	44	38	61	55	30	67				
MUL	42			42							
WHT	45	49	44	49	49	35	34				
FRL	43	49	48	50	46	32	47				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	363
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	64
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	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	45
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 lowest performance cell was our L25 math students. This has been a trend the last three years.

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

ELA proficiency dropped 5 points from the previous year. Third grade proficiency scores dropped 11 points impacting the overall proficiency score for the 18/19 school year.

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.

We are 20 points away form the state average in math proficiency and 21 points away from math learning gains. There are definite gaps in our math instruction.

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

There was a 6 point increase in ELA learning gains. There was a strong focus on ELA Tier 1 instruction across all grade levels.

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

Attendance is an issue and an area concern. If a student is not in class they are not going to make the expected gains.

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

1. Math Tier 1 Instruction and Learning Gains
2. ELA Tier 1 Instruction and Learning Gains
3. Number of Level 1 students in 3rd, 4th and 5th
4. Attendance
5. Bridging the Achievement Gap

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Trend data for ELA proficiency has plateaued, while minimal increases are seen in learning gains and L25 gains.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 40% to 57%, as measured by FSA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Continue use of coaching cycle in ELA for identified teachers and grade levels. Facilitate ELA-focused, consistent and sustained professional development with a focus on standards-based instruction, target and task alignment, and the 3 ELA shifts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Assessment data can be used to drive whole class, small group and individual student instruction. If students are not working on grade level tasks, and reading grade level text, they will not be able to perform at the depth of the standard.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborative planning focusing on tier 1 instruction including use of NewsELA as part of the core curriculum and small group instruction.
2. Instructional rounds providing feedback from administration and ILT.
3. Clearly defined interventions used during tiers 2 and 3.
4. Weekly professional development, conducted through PLCs focusing on high-yield strategies, monitored with feedback during daily walkthroughs.
5. Task alignment to the standards monitored and evidenced through rigorous student work.
6. Reading Recovery for specific students based on grade level data in First Grade.

Person Responsible Jennifer Ovalle (ovallej@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Downward or flat trend noted in math proficiency and gains. We are being outperformed by like schools in the area of mathematics.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of all students achieving math proficiency will increase from 43% to 57%, as measured by FSA. The percentage of all students showing learning gains in math will increase from 41% to 60%, as measured by FSA. The percentage of all L25 students showing learning gains in math will increase from 32% to 55%, as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, and Number Routines. Support this work through curriculum meetings, PLCs,feedback and/or the use of classroom video. Empower mathematics teacher leaders to create and sustain a culture of feedback and openness, including ongoing teacher to teacher feedback, learning walks, using the Coached Observation Protocol.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research based instructional strategies will have the most impact. Coached Observation Protocol is a powerful part of MLTI training for this year.

Action Steps to Implement

1. ILT will facilitate collaborative planning focused on tier 1 standards-based instruction (attend collaborative planning hubs).
2. Define math interventions and provide professional development on resources inside the building.
3. Develop ongoing professional development that includes teacher leaders. (Ex: fishbowls and rigor walks)
4. Use Ready Math, MAP data, and unit assessment data to determine individual student needs.
5. Utilize district resources with focused professional development. (Ready Math and Dreambox)

Person Responsible	Sandy Brodney (brodneys@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Trend data for science is relatively flat and aligns with 5th grade ELA data. Our current level of performance is 39%. This is because the depth of knowledge of standards and the varying use of high yield strategies is not occurring on a regular basis.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of all students achieving science proficiency will increase from 38% to 57%, as measured by SSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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:	Assessment data can be used to drive whole class, small group and individual student instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Science text incorporated into tier one instruction across all grade levels.
2. Science text used during ELA intervention block.
3. Revisit standards fourth grade students missed.
4. Data chats centered on cycle 3 and cycle 1 assessment data.
5. Pre-school visit during PLCs resources inside Science Gateway.
6. Monitor use of science lab.

Person Responsible   Kurt Wyne (wynek@pcsb.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Title Bridging the Gap Plan (Black Student Achievement) There was a 12% point drop in ELA from the previous year with our black students. There was an 8% drop from the previous year with our white students. Both are disappointing, but we must close the gap as there is a 17% difference between white students and black students.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of black students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 24% to 41%, as measured by ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementing culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as oral language, storytelling, cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, morning meetings, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of lesson plans in order to increase the percentage of black students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We are committed to culturally relevant curriculum and engaging instruction in all classrooms. We will demonstrate this through the use of AVID strategies as well as culturally relevant teaching.

Action Steps to Implement

1. ILT provides feedback that is actionable and targeted on equity based strategies.
2. Embedded time during PLCs to visit classrooms and observe culturally relevant instruction.
3. Implement AVID/CRT strategies school wide.
4. Align deliberate practice plans with professional development that address areas of need based on school grade level data.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Bachnik (wassel-bachnikj@pcsb.org)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Negligible increase in proficiency compared to last year, but slight increase in overall gains and greatest increase in L25. ELA deficiency could be the reason for no students proficient in science.
Measurable Outcome:	Our overall proficiency data was 26%. Our goal will be 51%. The percentage of ESE students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 14% to 41%, as measured by ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use a push-in and/or inclusion model for our VE Resource students. They will have the same access to the same grade level text as Gen Ed students. They will be required to perform the same tasks with supports noted in their IEP.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Statistics show that ESE students can perform on grade level when presented with grade level materials and resources. We fully expect that, with supports, our students will close the gap this year.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborate planning with ESE teachers and Gen Ed teachers led by instructional coaches.
2. Inclusive scheduling to the maximum extent possible.
3. Make sure the interventions for ESE are research-based curriculum measures.
4. All students will have access to grade level text.
5. ILT will monitor data and instructional practices taking place with our ESE students.

Person Responsible	Kurt Wyne (wynek@pcsb.org)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Decrease in gains and proficiency compared to 18-19 school year. ELA deficiency could be the reason for low proficiency in science.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of ELL students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 28% to 40%, as measured by ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom teachers will collaborate with the ESOL teacher to plan and deliver instruction to their EL students aligned with their language proficiency levels. The EL instruction and activities will be based on grade level standards and will include language objectives that will support their English language development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers provide EL students with rigorous lessons that are aligned to on grade level standards and instruction and are aligned to their English language abilities, the gap will be reduced by at least 10%.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize Ellevation to obtain students' length of time in schools and language proficiency.
2. Provide learning opportunities for teachers on the use of WIDA reports and support differentiated planning and instruction, based on student language proficiency.
3. Utilize and monitor the implementation of Model Performance Indicators to ensure instruction and scaffolding provide appropriate entry-point for grade-level content with ongoing support.
4. Administrators will monitor lesson planning and classroom implementation of effective lessons to engage ELs in rigorous, standards based work rich in language development. Utilize Marzano Focus Model to provide ongoing feedback to teachers to support development of their practice in supporting ELs.
6. Create a schedule for the Bilingual Assistant that directly supports standards-based instruction.
7. Ensure school communication is available in languages spoken by ELs.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Ovalle (ovallej@pcsb.org)

#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Attendance is an issue at the school. Approximately 20% of our student population missed 10% or more of the school year. This is an improvement over the previous school year.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of all students, who are missing no more than 10% of school, will increase from 20% to 12%, as measured by attendance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Student self-monitoring with incentives for improved attendance. Individual classrooms will have incentives to improve attendance via a classroom based system. (Dojo, Homework passes, Tech time, etc) We will also use PBIS strategies to motivate students and parents to attend school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Chronic absenteeism puts students at a great er risk of falling behind during their academic career, especially in the area of literacy. Students reading at grade level in 3rd grade are four times more likely to graduate high school and pursue post graduate education.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement PBIS strategies making school a priority.
2. Child Study Team will provide support to families that have high absenteeism.
3. Student recognition during Awards Ceremony.
4. Social Worker will provide support to families with high absenteeism.
5. Member of Child Study team will call parent if a student shows a pattern of absenteeism during the first quarter of the school year.

Person Responsible Kurt Wyne (wynek@pcsb.org)

#8. Other specifically relating to School Climate / Conditions for Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 19-20 school year, we were averaging 5-10 behavior calls per day.
Measurable Outcome:	We will average less than 4 behavior calls per day during the 20-21 school year. The problem is occurring because of an inconsistency in the understanding and application of behavioral expectation and Tier 1 instructional practices.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Establish and maintain positive relationships with students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies and actions are based on research and evidence-based nationally recognized programs (PBIS and Restorative Practices). The specific strategies and actions within our SIP were selected to match our school-specific needs based on our review of data utilizing an equity problem-solving process.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Each teacher will greet students at the door by their name as they enter the class. Leadership will conduct walkthroughs to ensure that implementation/greeting is occurring with consistency.
2. During the first 10 days of school, teachers and students will collaboratively develop classroom agreements/rules that reflect the school-wide expectations by engaging student voices using fair process for all classes. Agreements/Rules will be submitted to the PBIS Team.
3. During pre-planning, SBLT will provide a schedule for the delivery of the lessons 1-7 from the PCS Improving School Climate and Culture Toolkit to teach students how to use restorative circles and dialogue to be used during the 1st quarter.

Person Responsible	Anna Patterson (pattersona@pcsb.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As the result of equity-centered problem solving within an MTSS framework, we will build relational capacity, empower student voice, and hold high expectations through whole school Professional Development. We will focus on culturally relevant teaching and restorative practices.

Measurable Outcome:	We will increase the use of culturally relevant teaching and restorative practices as evidenced in our school-wide walk-through data and referral data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To address mindset shift for the adoption of equitable practice, we will participate in whole school equity-centered PD. Our current data illustrates African American students are receiving disciplinary referrals at a greater rate than their peers. The issue may be impacted by strengthening culturally relevant practice through targeted, sustained professional development. We will measure progress by recording the number of PD sessions and the number of teachers who attend PD and also our referral rate for black vs. non-black students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Culturally relevant teaching and restorative practices professional development. We will coordinate with our Equity Champion and training opportunities presented through PCS.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Our Equity Champion and/or IIRP Trainer will work side by side to deliver lessons outlined in the Equity PD Modules and IIRP notebook.
2. Monthly staff meetings or PLCs will be designated the third week of each month centered on Equity and Restorative Practices.
3. SBLT, Equity Champion and IIRP trainer will meet monthly to discuss focused content.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Bachnik (wassel-bachnikj@pcsb.org)

#10. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of performance is bronze as evidenced in Alliance for a Healthier Generation.
Measurable Outcome:	74th Street Elementary earned the Bronze Award and our target is the Silver Award.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through our healthy schools program, we have adopted policies and practices that empower the entire school community to move more, eat better, and develop healthy habits.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Everyone deserves a healthy future. We must empower everyone to make good choices as it relates to their health.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Offer healthy breakfast and lunch to all students.
2. Complete healthy schools program assessment.
3. Offer 150 minutes of physical education weekly.
4. 20 minutes of recess daily.
5. Professional development for staff focused on health related activities.
6. Designate a fitness area for staff members.

Person Responsible Kurt Wyne (wynek@pcsb.org)

#11. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on FSA data our students fall below state average in ELA, Math and Science. We expect all achievement levels to increase as outlined in our Areas of Focus. We want to strengthen our family and school partnerships to support achievement and school improvement.
Measurable Outcome:	We will improve student achievement as outlined in our SIP goals. We will have at least 50% of our families respond to our Annual Title 1 survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Parents are essential to the learning process. Recognizing that not every student will have a traditional parent or family structure, it is important to welcome guardians and other student advocates to be a valued part of the school community.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Parental involvement speaks volumes about the relationship between the school and the community. It is also a way to show students that they are valued.

Action Steps to Implement

During the school year we will:
1. Communicate weekly via School Messenger, Class Dojo, our marquee, student planners and our website.
2. Facilitate and host parent/teacher conference nights in-person and virtually.
3. Host FSA and academic support nights focused on FSA and specific content areas.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Ovalle (ovallej@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School Based Leadership Team and Instructional Leadership Team will monitor other schoolwide improvement initiatives.

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.

We consistently use data to set goals and informs policies and practices within the school. The more a leadership team knows about the students' needs and current performance, the better they can create structures and implement plans that build the desired school climate. (school attendance, discipline, academic performance) We use data points to provide additional supports to ensure high engagement for students and their families.

Teachers have input into school decisions as a way to increase leadership capacity and inform their instruction.
The relationship between staff and administration is important for communicating within the school. Involved leadership influences how others are able to connect and relate to the school culture.

Parents are essential to the learning process. Recognizing that not every student will have a traditional parent or family structure, it is important to welcome guardians and other student advocates to be a valued part of the school community. Parental involvement speaks volumes about the relationship between the school and the community. It is also a way to show students that they are valued.

Students are important stakeholders in the school community. Their voice is critical to the decisions and plans of the school. There are a number of ways to involve students in shaping the school culture. Our leadership team is willing to listen and respond to the ideas and concerns of students. This builds relationships.

We have identified clear expectations about the school environment and those expectations are clear for students and staff. Everyone is accountable for progress and learning. Clear expectations keep everyone aligned to the mission and vision of the school.

PTA, SAC and the AdvancED survey are all ways for parent and families to stay involved and provide input. All of these are used to help adjust our practice and look at structure to impact outcomes. A copy of our our Parent Family and Engagement Plan has been uploaded as well.

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	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: School Climate / Conditions for Learning	$0.00
9	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	$0.00
10	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools	$0.00
11	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00