Seventy Fourth St. Elementary

2021-22 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: 7/15/2019

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
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* 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%)
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	
* 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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	58%

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.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hathaway, Jessley	Principal	The role of the principal is to provide strategic direction in the school, support a standardized curriculum, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement data, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate the staff and oversee facilities.
Killian, Tamara	Reading Coach	Reading/MTSS Coach
Ketchem, Nicole	Math Coach	Math/Science Coach
Bachnik, Jennifer	School Counselor	School Counselor / Bullying Investigator
Holland-Alligood, Kalli	Behavior Specialist	Equity Champion
Patterson, Anna	Behavior Specialist	ESE Chairperson
Owens, Alexandra	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal - Member of the Instructional Leadership Team and support the mission/vision of 74th Street Elementary.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/15/2019, 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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

490

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

18

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

19

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	69	85	70	68	70	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	433
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
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	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	1	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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

Thursday 8/19/2021

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	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

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	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

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				40%	54%	57%	45%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	59%	58%	49%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	54%	53%	44%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				43%	61%	63%	46%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				41%	61%	62%	35%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	48%	51%	37%	42%	47%
Science Achievement				39%	53%	53%	34%	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	34%	56%	-22%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	37%	62%	-25%	62%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	64%	-13%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	60%	-15%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	53%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

NWEA - MAP

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41	31	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	29	43
	Students With Disabilities	36	14	43
	English Language Learners	10	8	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48	54	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	51	57
	Students With Disabilities	36	36	43
	English Language Learners	20	17	83

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26	38	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	40	29
	Students With Disabilities	36	42	42
	English Language Learners	17	43	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46	36	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	39	38
	Students With Disabilities	64	42	33
	English Language Learners	38	32	35

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	38	44	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	39	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	14	33	N/A
	English Language Learners	30	30	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	49	46	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	43	37
	Students With Disabilities	38	43	35
	English Language Learners	22	30	40

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	37	26	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	25	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	29	25	N/A
	English Language Learners	31	8	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	31	26	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	21	16
	Students With Disabilities	24	21	17
	English Language Learners	23	15	17

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29	28	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	26	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	6	5	N/A
	English Language Learners	33	17	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	23	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	26	27
	Students With Disabilities	0	5	5
	English Language Learners	29	29	29
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64	79	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	68	82	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	46	61	N/A
	English Language Learners	50	100	N/A

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	11	28		22	17		10				
ELL	22			33							
ASN	58			67							
BLK	18			18			25				
HSP	27	47		33	18		40				
WHT	22	19		32	38		30				
FRL	25	37		29	23	20	32				
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						

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
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				
FRL	44	49	46	41	33	39	29				

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	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	254
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
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	33

English Language Learners	
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	63
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	20
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	35
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	28
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	29
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 lowest performance cell was L25 math students. This has been a trend the last three years.

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

ELA proficiency dropped 5 points from the previous year. Third grade scores dropped three points from the 18/19 school year.

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

Attendance continues to be a concern and it definitely has an impact on student learning. Also, greater alignment to target and task will be a strong focus during collaborative planning.

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

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

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

Greater alignment to the district modules. Improved writing proficiency scores helped a swell.

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

1. Math Tier 1 Instruction - Collaborative planning and focusing on standards-based instruction.
2. ELA Tier 1 Instruction - Collaborative planning and focusing on standards-based instruction.
3. Targeted interventions for Level 1 students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades.
4. Child Study Team continuing to focus on attendance and fostering relationships with families.

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.

1. Equity training and a greater understanding of our student population.
2. Tier 1 core instruction with a strong focus on planning.

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

We will look to increase the percentage of students attending our extended learning opportunities during the school year. Also ensuring that those students in ELP are working on grade level tasks in both reading and math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practice was determined to be our area of focus for ELA. Teacher delivery and facilitation of grade level standards must be data-driven if students are going to master the standards. It is obvious, based on data, that our students are struggling to master the standards in specific grade levels as evidenced by proficiency scores. This is evident in 18/19 FSA, 19/20 MAP and 20/21 MAP results.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of students reaching ELA proficiency will increase to 50% in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades. The percentage of students making learning gains on FSA and MAP will increase to 60%. The percentage of L25 students making learning gains on FSA and MAP will increase to 60%
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored by end of module assessments, ISIP, checks for understanding, MAP and walk-through feedback from the instructional leadership team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will collaboratively plan standards-based lessons with the end in mind as it directly relates to student task. The student tasks must get to the end result which allows the student to master the standard. The teacher will focus on task alignment, develop foundational skills and monitor student evidence in order to take action if needed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Prior to teaching any lesson, instructional staff will plan with the end in mind and focus on the student task. This will be done through collaborative planning sessions with coaches and teachers (Gen Ed/ESE/ELL). After planning the lessons and discussing possible misconceptions, teachers must observe and monitor student work to and make instructional decisions based on student evidence. Student misconceptions can then be corrected with a whole class or small group reteach.

Action Steps to Implement

Staff will use Instructional Practice Guides for Tier 1 planning and instruction. We will revisit and reteach the IPGs during PLCs in August/September.

Person Responsible Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

Collaborative planning focusing on tier 1 instruction including use of NewsELA as part of the core curriculum and small group instruction.

Person Responsible Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

Use Reading Recovery teachers to support planning and instruction in Kdg-2nd grades.

Person Responsible Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

Cluster ELL, ESE and Gifted students in classrooms so teachers can plan, co-teach and monitor lessons.

Person Responsible Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

Weekly professional development, conducted through PLCs focusing on high-yield strategies, monitored with feedback during daily walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Tamara Killian (killiant@pcsb.org)

Task alignment to the standards monitored and evidenced through rigorous student work.

Person Responsible Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

Clear focus in Jan Richardson Guided Reading during our ELA intervention block in Kdg-2nd grade with a strong focus on print, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.

Person Responsible Tamara Killian (killiant@pcsb.org)

Clearly defined interventions used during Tier 2 and 3.

Person Responsible Tamara Killian (killiant@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practice was determined to be our are of focus for math. Teacher delivery and facilitation of grade level standards must be data-driven if students are going to master the standards. It is obvious, based on data, that our students are struggling to master the standards in specific grade levels as evidenced by proficiency scores. This is evident in 18/19 FSA, 19/20 MAP and 20/21 MAP results.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of students reaching Math proficiency will increase to 50% in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades. The percentage of students making learning gains on FSA and MAP will increase to 60%. The percentage of L25 students making learning gains on FSA and MAP will increase to 60%
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored by end of unit assessments, ticket out the door formative assessments, student journals, Dreambox, checks for understanding, MAP and walk-through feedback from the instructional leadership team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will collaboratively plan standards-based lessons with the end in mind as it directly relates to student task. The student tasks must get to the end result which allows the student to master the standard. The teacher will focus on task alignment, develop foundational skills and monitor student evidence in order to take action if needed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Prior to teaching any lesson, instructional staff will plan with the end in mind and focus on the student task. This will be done through collaborative planning sessions with coaches and teachers (Gen Ed/ESE/ELL). After planning the lessons and discussing possible misconceptions, teachers must observe and monitor student work to and make instructional decisions based on student evidence. Student misconceptions can then be corrected with a whole class or small group reteach.

Action Steps to Implement

ILT will facilitate collaborative planning focused on tier 1 standards-based instruction (attend collaborative planning hubs).

Person Responsible	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

Define math interventions and provide professional development on resources inside the building.

Person Responsible	Nicole Ketchem (ketchemn@pcsb.org)

Develop ongoing professional development that includes teacher leaders. (Ex: fishbowls and rigor walks)

Person Responsible	Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

Use Ready Math, MAP data, and unit assessment data to determine individual student needs.

Person Responsible	Nicole Ketchem (ketchemn@pcsb.org)

Utilize district resources with focused professional development. (Ready Math and Dreambox)

Person Responsible	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practice was determined to be our are of focus for Science. Teacher delivery and facilitation of grade level standards must be data-driven if students are going to master the standards. It is obvious, based on data, that our students are struggling to master the standards in specific grade levels as evidenced by proficiency scores. This is evident in 18/19 FSA and science unit assessments in 19/20 and 20/21
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of 5th grade students reaching proficiency will increase to 50%.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored by end of unit assessments, ticket out the door formative assessments, student journals, checks for understanding and walk-through feedback from the instructional leadership team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will collaboratively plan standards-based lessons with the end in mind as it directly relates to student task using the 3-1 (Ignite-Investigate-Inform) Instructional Model. The student tasks must get to the end result which allows the student to master the standard. The teacher will focus on task alignment, develop foundational skills and monitor student evidence in order to take action if needed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Prior to teaching any lesson, instructional staff will plan with the end in mind and focus on the student task. This will be done through collaborative planning sessions with coaches and teachers (Gen Ed/ESE/ELL). After planning the lessons and discussing possible misconceptions, teachers must observe and monitor student work to and make instructional decisions based on student evidence. Student misconceptions can then be corrected with a whole class or small group reteach.

Action Steps to Implement

Science text incorporated into tier one instruction across all grade levels.

Person Responsible	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

Science text used during ELA intervention block.

Person Responsible	Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

Revisit standards in 3rd and 4th grades where our students are showing gaps.

Person Responsible	Nicole Ketchem (ketchemn@pcsb.org)

Data chats centered on cycle 3 and cycle 1 assessment data.

Person Responsible	Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

Pre-school training during PLCs to revisit resources inside Science Canvas.

Person Responsible	Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

Monitor use of science lab.

Person Responsible	Nicole Ketchem (ketchemn@pcsb.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on previous FSA testing, as the African American population increased, the scores continued to drop.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of African-American students achieving ELA proficiency will increase to 41% during the 21/22 school year and move to 50% by the 22/23 school year as measured by the FSA.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored by end of module assessments, ISIP, checks for understanding, MAP, Running Records, our Bridging the Gap data in 3rd grade and walk-through feedback from the instructional leadership team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will implement culturally relevant instructional practices 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 African-American students achieving proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We chose these strategies largely due to gaps in academic data. As a staff, 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	

ILT provides feedback that is actionable and targeted on equity-based strategies. This can be done from student work observation and walk-through feedback.

Person Responsible	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

The Equity Team will facilitate embedded professional development third Tuesday of every month during PLCs to model and discuss high-yield teaching strategies. The team will also visit classrooms and conduct fishbowl lessons where teachers will observe culturally relevant instruction.

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

Implement AVID and culturally responsive teaching strategies school wide. Once a month, our after school PD will focus on how AVID/CRT strategies can impact students in 4th and 5th grades.

Person Responsible	Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

Align deliberate practice plans with professional development that address areas of need based on grade level data.

Person Responsible	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ESE proficiency scores have shown minimal to no gains for three years. Learning gains and L25 learning gains have also been minimal. It is our firm belief that increased proficiency from our ESE subgroup will lead to a much improved overall school score. We believe there is a foundational literacy gap with a high percentage of our ESE students.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of ESE students reaching ELA proficiency will increase to 50% in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades. The percentage of ESE students making learning gains on FSA and MAP will increase to 60%. The percentage of ESE L25 students making learning gains on FSA and MAP will increase to 60%
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored by end of module assessments, ISIP, checks for understanding, looking at individual IEP goals, MAP and walk-through feedback from the instructional leadership team.
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 and mainstream model for our self-contained students. Students will have 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. Data for each ESE student will be examined to determine foundational gaps and instruction will occur during intervention block and core instructional time.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All students learn best and have a better chance of mastering grade level standards if the majority of their day is spent in a Gen Ed classroom. ESE teachers will collaborate and co-teach with Gen Ed classrooms in order to provide specialized instruction to ESE while aligning to grade level standards. Foundational gaps will be addressed during the intervention block in small groups. We fully expect that, with supports, our students will close the gap this school year.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative planning with ESE teachers and Gen Ed teachers led by instructional coaches.

Person Responsible	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

Inclusive scheduling to the maximum extent possible.

Person Responsible	Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

Make sure the interventions for ESE are research-based curriculum measures.

Person Responsible	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

All students will have access to grade level text.

Person Responsible	Tamara Killian (killiant@pcsb.org)

ILT will monitor data and instructional practices taking place with our ESE students.

Person Responsible Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELL proficiency scores have shown minimal to no gains for three years. Learning gains and L25 learning gains have also been minimal. It is our firm belief that increased proficiency from our ESE subgroup will lead to a much improved overall school score. We believe there is a foundational literacy gap with a high percentage of our ELL students.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of ELL students reaching ELA proficiency will increase to 50% in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades. The percentage of ELL students making learning gains on FSA and MAP will increase to 60%. The percentage of ELL L25 students making learning gains on FSA and MAP will increase to 60%
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored by end of module assessments, ISIP, checks for understanding, looking at individual ELL and WIDA goals, MAP and walk-through feedback from the instructional leadership team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are clustering ELL students based on language proficiency and ELL teachers will co-teach with Gen Ed teacher to provide in inclusive, core environment for ELL students. In addition, ELL students will have access to the same grade level text as Gen Ed students. They will be required to perform the same tasks with necessary supports. Data for each ELL student will be examined to determine foundational gaps and instruction will occur during intervention block and core instructional time to close learning gaps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All students learn best and have a better chance of mastering grade level standards if the majority of their day is spent in a Gen Ed classroom. ELL teachers will collaborate and co-teach with Gen Ed classrooms in order to provide specialized instruction to ELL while aligning to grade level standards. Foundational gaps will be addressed during the intervention block in small groups. We fully expect that, with supports, our students will close the gap this school year.

Action Steps to Implement

ILT will monitor lesson planning and implementation of effective lessons to engage ELs in rigorous, standards-based work rich in language development. Utilize the Marzano Focus Model to provide ongoing feedback.

Person Responsible	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

Develop a plan to monitor the LF student performance.

Person Responsible	Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

Create a schedule ELL team that directly supports standards-based instruction for ELs; include appropriate PD.

Person Responsible	Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

Have a school plan for meaningful communication with families via the website, newsletter, parent letters, phone calls, etc. and ensure communication is available in languages spoken by ELs

Person Responsible	Tamara Killian (killiant@pcsb.org)

#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Attendance is an issue at our school. Well over 20% of our student population missed 10% or more of the school year for three consecutive years.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of all students, who are missing more than 10% of school days, will decrease from 20% to 12%, as measured by attendance data.
Monitoring:	Evidence will be monitored by Child Study Team using average daily attendance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will strengthen our attendance problem-solving process to address and support students and families across all tiers. This will be done throughout the year and will include positive incentives.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Chronic absenteeism puts students at a greater risk of falling behind during their academic career, especially in the areas of literacy and math. Students reading at a 3rd grade level are four times more likely to graduate high school and pursue a post graduate education.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement PBIS strategies making school a priority.

Person Responsible	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

Child Study Team will provide support to families that have high absenteeism.

Person Responsible	Kalli Holland-Alligood (hollandkal@pcsb.org)

Student recognition during Awards Ceremony.

Person Responsible	Kalli Holland-Alligood (hollandkal@pcsb.org)

Social Worker will provide support to families with high absenteeism.

Person Responsible	Anna Patterson (pattersona@pcsb.org)

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	Kalli Holland-Alligood (hollandkal@pcsb.org)

#8. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 20/21 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 expectations and Tier 1 instructional practices.
Monitoring:	Based on our school-wide, behavioral call log data, we will show an average of 4 or less behavior calls per day.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Establish and maintain positive relationships with students while focusing on Tier 1 core instruction.
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

Each teacher will greet students at the door, by their name, every day as they enter the classroom.

Person Responsible	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

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.

Person Responsible	Kalli Holland-Alligood (hollandkal@pcsb.org)

During pre-planning, SBLT will focus on restorative circles and dialogue to be used during the 1st quarter.

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

Set clear school-wide social expectations.

Person Responsible	Kalli Holland-Alligood (hollandkal@pcsb.org)

Acknowledge and reinforce positive behavior.

Person Responsible	Anna Patterson (pattersona@pcsb.org)

Collection and review of behavior data to drive decision making.

Person Responsible	Anna Patterson (pattersona@pcsb.org)

Foundations Team will continue to determine behavior management system and PBIS.

Person Responsible	Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

#9. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on FSA data, our students fall below state averages in below the state averages in ELA, Math and Science. We expect all achievement elves 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 and have at least 50% of our families respond to our Annual Title 1 survey.
Monitoring:	FSA data and Annual Title 1 Survey result data.
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 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 they are valued.

Action Steps to Implement

Communicate weekly via School Messenger, Class Dojo, our marquee, student planners and our website.

Person Responsible	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

Facilitate and host parent/teacher conference nights in-person and virtually.

Person Responsible	Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

Host FSA and academic support nights focused on FSA and specific content areas.

Person Responsible	Tamara Killian (killiant@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.
Monitoring:	Our Health and Wellness Coordinator will monitor during the year to ensure we are reaching our objectives.
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 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

Offer healthy breakfast and lunch to all students.

Person Responsible Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

Offer 150 minutes of physical education weekly.

Person Responsible Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

20 minutes of recess daily.

Person Responsible Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

Professional development for staff focused on health-related activities.

Person Responsible Alexandra Owens (owensal@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.

Looking at the data in SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, if we were to list any concerns, we will work to get to zero bullying incidents. We will monitor this through our school call log, referral data and district reporting system.

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 consistently use data to set goals and inform policies and practices within the school. The more a leadership team knows the students' needs and current performance, the better they can create structure an implement plans that build the desired school climate. School attendance, discipline data and academic performance data are all indicators of a positive school culture and environment. We use data points to provide additional supports to ensure high engagement for students and their families.

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

Teachers have input in 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 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 realtionships.

We have identified 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 our end of year 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 Parent Family Engagement Plan has been updated as well.

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
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	General Fund		$0.00
			Notes: We will use these funds to increase our classroom libraries and our gathering area rugs for whole group instruction.			
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: Black/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: Culture & Environment: Discipline				$0.00
9	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement				$0.00
10	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools				$0.00
					Total:	$0.00