Cross Bayou Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 7/23/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-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	49%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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 - Care for Others
B - Be Responsible
E - Exhibit Perseverance
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	Position 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
Baxter, Heather	Teacher, K-12	1st grade Team Leader
Caldea, Vivian	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade Team Leader
Fulmer, Meagan	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade Team Leader
Ward, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	4th grade Team Leader
Rouse, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	5th grade Team Leader
Chrosniak, Jessica	School Counselor	Specialists Team Leader and School Counselor
Kuespert, Amy	Teacher, K-12	ESE Team Leader and note taker
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
Friday 7/23/2021, 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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

350

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	29	61	54	65	49	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	12	21	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/23/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				38%	54%	57%	40%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	59%	58%	40%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	54%	53%	44%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	61%	63%	55%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				50%	61%	62%	58%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29%	48%	51%	40%	42%	47%
Science Achievement				39%	53%	53%	57%	57%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	31%	56%	-25%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	56%	-8%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	54%	-21%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	64%	-1%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	60%	-14%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

MAP

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	28	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	23	31
	Students With Disabilities	22	20	20
	English Language Learners	17	0	14
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37	37	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	33	26
	Students With Disabilities	33	40	20
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	46	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	48	44
	Students With Disabilities	8	15	23
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	38	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	41	38
	Students With Disabilities	11	6	11
	English Language Learners	14	0	0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	37	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	38	31
	Students With Disabilities	0	9	10
	English Language Learners	25	25	25
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34	42	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	44	43
	Students With Disabilities	8	14	15
	English Language Learners	13	25	25

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	47	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	40	30
	Students With Disabilities	50	30	30
	English Language Learners	20	18	9
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43	35	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	28	35
	Students With Disabilities	25	25	33
	English Language Learners	36	25	42

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37	32	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	26	18
	Students With Disabilities	27	20	13
	English Language Learners	23	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	38	42	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	36	23
	Students With Disabilities	27	27	25
	English Language Learners	31	23	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	75.8		90.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	70.3		89.2
	Students With Disabilities	71.4		80.0
	English Language Learners	63.6		84.6

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	29	46		28	38		29				
ELL	22	46		38	54		23				
ASN	63			79							
BLK				6							
HSP	24			35							
MUL	50			30							
WHT	37	36	30	47	53		39				
FRL	27	28	27	37	36	25	18				

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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	305

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	71
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	3
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	31
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	30
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our ELA and Math scores continue to be low with minimum change from each cycle. Sub groups are still performing below. Our ELL performance is very low in all grade levels.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA and Math proficiency for all grade levels

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

With online learning for the end of the 19/20 school year and online option for the 20/21 school year, many of our students did not receive the support needed to make growth and to make up the skills they have missed. Having all face to face instruction for the 21/22 school year will help our students make growth. The addition of Project 23 Interventionists in Reading and Math will also help our students received additional support in ELA and Math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science proficiency

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our 5th grade teachers had planned and implemented a plan to address science deficiencies and were able to implement this plan right when school started.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Continue to plan and implement science plan at the beginning of this year.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We use our bi-monthly PLC's to review data and give grade specific PD. We provide PD 2 times per month at our Curriculum/PD meetings, which include specific strategy implementation, vertical team PLC's and training from our Dreambox Champion .

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Small group instruction to target the students specific needs, inclusion model for ESE support, Project 23 Interventionists for the next 2 years.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We reviewed data from our 2019 Science FSA and from our Science Diagnostic data. Based on this data and observations of science instruction, we have seen our students becoming more proficient in understanding science concepts, including those 3rd and 4th grade standards that students did not show proficiency on in the Science Diagnostic. Our 2019 FSA data showed 39% of our 5th grade students were proficient. Our 20/21 Diagnostic scores showed 48% proficiency at the beginning of the year and 75% proficiency at the mid year. Our Spring Mock FSA only showed 57% proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of students scoring Level 3 or higher on will increase from 32% to 60% or higher as measured by the 2022 Science FSA
Monitoring:	We will measure progress toward this goal using the Science Diagnostic and Mid Year Science Diagnostic as a way to measure growth in the standards the students needed to master. Then we will use the Spring Mock FSA to target standards to review before the Science FSA. Teachers will use formative assessments during Science lessons to monitor student understanding of concepts taught.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Develop, implement and monitor a data-driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4tgh grade Fall Diagnostic Assessment and revise after data analysis of the Spring Mock SSA. 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:	We have data that supports our students do not retain the standards taught in grades 3 and 4. We need to know what standards this group of students needs support in acquiring.

Action Steps to Implement	
Administrators will monitor the use of the Science lab and the assessment data.	
Utilize Science gaming programs/Science videos during lunch to reinforce concepts.	
Person Responsible	Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)
Develop and implement the 5th grade plan at the beginning of the year to address the gaps of 3rd and 4th grade standards.	
Implement the 5th grade review plan in chunks and aligned to the unit 5th grade is teaching.	
Person Responsible	Stacy Rouse (rouses@pcsb.org)
Teachers participate in Science PD during PLC's and Curriculum meetings.	
Use Vertical articulation with grade levels during Curriculum Meetings.	
Administrators monitor classroom instruction through walk throughs and lesson plan review.	
Person Responsible	Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our Spring 2021 MAP data, we are only showing 31% or our students in grades 2-5 scoring at the 61st percentile and 29% of our students in grades K-1 at the 61st percentile. Based on this data, we need to ensure all students receive core math instruction at the level of the standard and that targeted interventions are being provided for students not meeting the standard.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 43% to 63% or higher as measured by the 2022 Math FSA. The number of students scoring at the 61st percentile on Math MAP assessment for grades K-5 will increase from 30% to 50% or higher as measured by the Spring 2022 Math MAP assessment.
Monitoring:	We will utilize MAP assessments in Fall and Winter to measure our progress toward our goal. We will also use classroom assessments to measure attainment of specific standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Empower mathematics teacher leaders to flesh out the school plan. Monitor the flow of the math block for pacing to include rigorous grade level content, purposeful practice and remediation/enrichment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers need to have a strong understanding of math content they are teaching. They need ongoing training and feedback on math content and their implementation to the level of the standards. Teachers also need to utilize small group instruction to support students who need additional strategies or practice to attain concepts.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure all classrooms have adequate manipulative or student use in math lessons.
Administrators will monitor effective implementation of Ready Mathematics and Dreambox Learning.
Teachers will use the 5 question pre-requisite assessment prior to each unit and use the result for planning math instruction. Administrators will monitor the assessment data.
Utilize district planning documents to incorporate mathematics unit planning into the calendar.
Project 23 Math Interventionist will teach daily small groups in grades K-3 that show need of math support based on assessment scores and/or classroom performance.

Person Responsible	Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

Math Cadre will develop and lead monthly PD.
Dreambox Champion will lead monthly PD, monitor Dreambox usage and set goals goals for teachers/ students to increase usage.
Teachers will participate in math PD and will use their data at PLC's to determine how to meet needs of all students.

Person Responsible	Lynette Jones (jonesly@pcsb.org)

Provide TDE's for teachers to collaboratively plan out rich problem solving math lessons.
Calendar dates for all trainings focused on Mathematics, including pre-school, monthly staff trainings and

PLC meetings.
Administrators will monitor the flow of the math block weekly.
Administrators will meet bi-weekly with Project 23 Math Interventionist to review data.

Person Responsible   Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our Spring MAP data, we are only showing 34% of our students in grades 2-5 scoring at the 61st percentile and 29% of our students in grades K-1 scoring at the 61st percentile. Based on this data we need to ensure that all students receive core ELA instruction at the level of the standard and that targeted interventions are being provided for students not meeting the standard.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 35% to 60% or higher as measured by the 2022 ELA FSA. The number of students scoring at the 61st percentile on ELA MAP assessment for grades K-5 will increase from 33% to 50% or higher as measured by the Spring 2022 ELA MAP assessment.
Monitoring:	We will utilize MAP assessments in Fall and Winter to measure our progress toward our goal. We will also use classroom assessments to measure attainment of specific standards. Frequent monitoring of ELA progress using an ELA tool appropriate for each grade level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitate ELA-focused, equity based professional development that is teacher and student centered, instructionally relevant, and actionable. Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, feedback, etc.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers need to have a strong understanding of the ELA content they are teaching. They need ongoing training and feedback on ELA content and their implementation to the level of the standards. Teachers also need to utilize small group instruction to support students who need additional strategies or practice to attain concepts.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide TDE's for teachers to collaboratively plan ELA modules and determine instructional strategies that will support high student achievement.
Calendar dates for all ELA training, including pre-school, monthly staff trainings and PLC meetings.
Include regular collaborative opportunities to rehearse and refine practices, examine tasks, assignments, student work and multiple data points to determine progress and plan forward.
Provide PD on K-2 B.E.S.T. ELA standards.

Person Responsible	Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

K-2 teachers will put into practice the strategies they learned in the book study they completed last school year (Equipped for Reading Success - One Minute Drills).
Administrators will observed foundational skills instruction alongside ELA Champions.
Utilize district model classroom support documents for planning.
Project 23 ELA Interventionist will teach daily small groups in grades K-3 that show need of ELA support based on assessment scores and/or classroom performance.
Administrators will meet bi-weekly with Project 23 ELA Interventionist to review data.
Administrators will monitor assessment data with teachers.

Person Responsible	Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of performance in regards to School Wide Behavior is 15 Office Referrals. Looking deeper at the discipline code data, our 2 highest reasons for ODR are Strike/Student (6 referrals) and Repeated Misconduct (5 referrals).
Measurable Outcome:	The number of students receiving ODR under the category of Strike/Student will decrease from 6 to 4 or fewer as measured by the end of the 2022 school year School Profiles Report.
Monitoring:	We will monitor this through FOCUS and the number of ODR input with the discipline code of Strike/Student.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)
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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We are concerned about the number of students that are solving issues by striking others students. We have re-vamped our PBIS systems to help teachers/staff be more supportive for students.

Action Steps to Implement

Teach students/staff our new core values.
Teach staff our new major/minor infractions chart.
Review with staff the implementation of RP and PBIS strategies.
Determine with students what they want to work for and develop a system of fairness to help them meet their goals.

Person Responsible	Jessica Chrosniak (chrosniakj@pcsb.org)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current attendance rate is 93.4% for the 20/21 school year. Our goal is to have an attendance rate of 95% or higher.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of students absent from 10% or more of the school year will decrease from 24% to 20% or less as evidenced by School Profiles.
Monitoring:	We will monitor attendance on a weekly basis.
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 6 years our percentage of students missing 10% of more of school has increased from 17% to 24%. This has a negative impact on learning. We have incentives for students who are in attendance on time at school and classroom incentives when their class has meet their weekly goal 4 times.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor student Absenteeism through the Child Study Team and make personal phone calls to parents to parents regarding their student's attendance.
Weekly drawing of students who were in attendance the entire week.
Each classroom receives an incentive (i.e. popcorn, cool pop) when their class meets their weekly attendance goal 4 times.
Put out signs with school hours at car circle/patio
Enforce a policy of no early release of students the last 30 minutes of the day.
late arriving students must have their parents sign them into the office.
Communicate our attendance goal and policies to our families.

Person Responsible   Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data we have from parents attending events in 19/20 was at a participation rate of 15%. We did not hold any in-person events for the 20/21 school year due to COVID protocols. For the 21/22 school year we want to have families attend events on campus either in person or virtually (if the planned event is conducive to virtual attendance). We want to re-connect in person with as many families as possible. Because we have not had families on campus this past year, we also want to build positive relationships by reaching out to families with positive phone calls this year.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of families participating in school events will increase from 15% to 30% or higher as measured by parent sign in sheets during the 21/22 school year.
Monitoring:	We monitor using RSVP forms for event planning and then use sign in sheets and after event surveys to monitor the number that attended and see if there are improvements we need to make for future events based on event survey answers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Have a monthly family event that provides strategies that parents can use to support student learning/ We will utilize event formats that are of interest to families, such as Escape Rooms, Reading Camp, Math Games to attract more families to participate.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By providing fun, curriculum based and in-person activities for families, we are anticipating better participation then in previous years since we were unable to have events last year.

Action Steps to Implement	

Plan Monthly Family Involvement activities to give parents strategies to help support their child's academic achievement.
Invite families to events via newsletter, phone calls home and marquee messages.
Translate weekly phone/email to families about upcoming events in Spanish.
Translate written message home in Spanish.
Teachers will make at least 1 positive phone call home per month to each family in their class to build a positive relationship with each family.
Phone calls/email will be recorded in the parent log in FOCUS

Person Responsible	Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of reading proficiency for black students is 12% as evidenced by the projected proficiency from Spring ELA MAP data. Our black students may need content presented in a variety of ways that are culturally responsive to ensure that they are understanding the standards being taught.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of black students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 5% to 41% or higher as measured by the 2022 ELA FSA.
	The number of black students scoring at the 61st percentile or higher will increase from 12% to 41% as measured by the 2022 Spring ELA MAP assessment.
	The number of black students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 11% to 41% or higher as measured by the 2022 ELA FSA.
	The number of black students scoring at the 61st percentile or higher will increase from 12% to 41% as measured by the 2022 Spring ELA MAP assessment.
Monitoring:	Black students who are not proficient reading in grades 3-5 will have bi-weekly or weekly Progress monitoring provided by either their Classroom teacher, ESE teacher or hourly teacher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will consistently implement Culturally Responsive Strategies and the 6 M's strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our black student 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

Teachers will utilize Culturally Relevant Strategies and 6 M's strategies.
Teachers will engage in Equity centered PD at PLC's and PD Meetings.
Teachers will monitor the academic growth of our black students on a weekly or bi-weekly basis.
Teachers will set academic growth goals with their black students after reviewing progress monitoring data each month.
Students will receive specific interventions matching their needs, including K-3rd grade participation with the Project 23 interventionists through strategic scheduling.
Students will be encouraged to participate in ELP opportunities and transportation may be provided.
Students in grades 3-5 will be assigned a PCS connect device to access District programs at school and at home.

Person Responsible	Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

#8. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of reading proficiency for SWD students is 17% as evidenced by the projected proficiency from Spring ELA MAP data. The current level of math proficiency for our SWD students is 24% as evidenced by the projected proficiency from Spring Math MAP data. Our SWD students may need more exposure to instructed skills, including using inclusion so they are not pulled out of the classroom during direct instruction. Using small groups to focus on specific skills will help reinforce skills being taught.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of SWD scoring Level 3 or higher in ELA will increase from 18% to 41% or higher as measured by the 2022 ELA FSA. The number of SWD scoring Level 3 or higher in Math will increase from 20% to 41% or higher as measured by the 2022 Math FSA.
Monitoring:	We will utilize MAP assessments in Fall and Winter to measure our progress toward our goal. We will also use classroom assessments to measure attainment of specific standards. We continue to have frequent assessments of our SWD students using math or ELA tools appropriated for each grade level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SWD 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 by using inclusionary practices.

Action Steps to Implement

Use ESE inclusion model in at least grades 4 and 5.
Provide time for VE Resource teachers and Gen Ed teachers to collaborate.
Monitor SWD student progress during bi weekly meeting with VE Resource Teachers to adjust instruction to meet student needs.
Primary teachers will implement strategies from Equipped for Success - One Minute Drills to diagnose ELA deficits to be addressed.
For skill remediation we will utilize informal assessments to identify skill deficits as related to students' individual IEP goals so teachers can address these deficits during instruction.

Person Responsible Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

We will continue to use our PBIS strategies and Restorative Practices strategies to continue to have low incidents of discipline.

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.

We will be re-establishing having events on campus. We will have a Meet your Teacher Event before school begins and will host a monthly curriculum focused event for parents.

We send out a weekly phone/email message to all families to remind them of important School information and upcoming events. We use a daily agenda book to support 2 way communication between teachers and parents. We have a monthly newsletter and a website that parents can go to for additional information on events and our school. We translate all written communication into Spanish.

We have our Title 1 Annual Meeting in which we will share our Title 1 plan resources and the benefits of being a Title 1 school. This will include reviewing our Title 1 compact.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

All Staff are stakeholders and are expected to promote a positive environment at school. All staff will learn about our revised PBIS plan and their role in promoting a positive school culture.

All students are stakeholders and are expected to participate in their learning in a positive manner. All students will learn about our revised PBIS plan impacts them and how they can contribute to the success of our school.

All parents are stakeholders and are encouraged to be a part of their child's education by participating in school events, communicating with their child's teacher and becoming part of our PTA/SAC.

We use surveys of staff/students/parents to gather information and make changes to programs based on survey feedback.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$2,130.45
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	0811 - Cross Bayou Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,130.45
			Notes: subs for TDE's			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$2,130.45
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	0811 - Cross Bayou Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,130.45
			Notes: Subs for TDE's			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports				$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement				$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American				$0.00
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$0.00
					Total:	$4,260.90