

Pinellas County Schools

Northwest Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Northwest Elementary School

5601 22ND AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33710

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

Demographics

Principal: Casey Maker

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2013

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 |
| 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2021-22 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (46%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | ATSI |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Northwest Elementary School

5601 22ND AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33710

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 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 | 49% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B | | B | B |

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 Northwest School Community is dedicated to building relationships that encourage the development of academic success, emotional intelligence, critical thinking and strong, caring citizens in a safe learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% student success

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Brainard, Marie | Principal | The roles and responsibilities of the leadership team include acting as instructional coaches, data managers and professional development support systems. Our members meet weekly to address, monitor and problem solve the current status of School Improvement plan goals. In these meetings, we discuss next steps and ways to address areas of concern. We then work together to draft a plan and make adjustments as needed if we are not on track with our original plan. |
| Wahl, Amanda | Assistant Principal | |
| Brisson, Marie | Instructional Coach | As the MTSS Coach it is their responsibility to monitor all data and allocate resources to support the various levels of need based on academics and behavior. |
| Camacho, Stephanie | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Rorer, Samuel | Teacher, ESE | |
| Accola, Tara | Behavior Specialist | |
| Snoots, Sebrina | Teacher, ESE | |
| Wood, Chris | Attendance/ Social Work | |
| Spaights, Rene | School Counselor | |
| Marion, Tina | Teacher, K-12 | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/10/2013, Casey Maker

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

466

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

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 41 | 78 | 82 | 83 | 71 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 434 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 26 | 33 | 27 | 26 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 15 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 20 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 2 | 18 | 7 | 11 | 22 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/8/2022

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 | 92 | 79 | 85 | 98 | 101 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 534 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 19 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 13 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

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 | 2 | 19 | 6 | 25 | 27 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |

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 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 92 | 79 | 85 | 98 | 101 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 534 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 19 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 13 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

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 | 2 | 19 | 6 | 25 | 27 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |

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 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 54% | 55% | 56% | | | | 47% | 54% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 62% | | | | | | 54% | 59% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 57% | | | | | | 64% | 54% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 62% | 51% | 50% | | | | 51% | 61% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 61% | | | | | | 59% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 32% | | | | | | 59% | 48% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 61% | 62% | 59% | | | | 45% | 53% | 53% |

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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 56% | -3% | 58% | -5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 56% | -17% | 58% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -53% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 54% | -12% | 56% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -39% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 62% | -9% | 62% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 64% | -21% | 64% | -21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -53% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 60% | -10% | 60% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -43% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 54% | -9% | 53% | -8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 31 | 44 | | 23 | 35 | 17 | | | | | |
| ELL | 49 | 59 | | 69 | 74 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 53 | 73 | | 73 | 73 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 28 | 56 | 45 | 36 | 50 | 31 | 41 | | | | |
| HSP | 55 | 59 | 55 | 71 | 62 | | 54 | | | | |
| MUL | 42 | 40 | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 67 | 64 | 67 | 64 | 36 | 70 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 56 | 48 | 55 | 56 | 36 | 50 | | | | |
| 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 | 25 | 39 | 40 | 29 | 21 | 10 | 16 | | | | |
| ELL | 52 | | | 75 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 47 | | | 68 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 50 | | 29 | 23 | | 15 | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | 50 | | 65 | 71 | | 43 | | | | |
| MUL | 38 | | | 38 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 56 | | 63 | 59 | | 56 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 54 | 45 | 48 | 43 | 18 | 36 | | | | |
| 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 | 33 | 38 | 21 | 59 | 63 | 13 | | | | |
| ELL | 57 | 74 | | 50 | 61 | | 42 | | | | |
| ASN | 71 | | | 64 | 90 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 48 | 54 | 27 | 53 | 75 | 6 | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 72 | | 59 | 60 | | 64 | | | | |
| MUL | 42 | | | 33 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | 48 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 53 | 50 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 50 | 55 | 45 | 55 | 63 | 43 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 56 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 56 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 445 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 30 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 61 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 68 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 41 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 58 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 44 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 62 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 50 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Based on 21-22 ELA MAP we saw: a 6% decrease in proficiency from Fall 2021 to Spring 2022 in Kindergarten and First grade. Second thru Fifth grade all had an increase in proficiency from Fall 2021 to Spring 2022.

Based on 21-22 Math MAP we saw: a slight decrease in proficiency in Kindergarten from Winter to Spring by 5%. All other grade levels stayed the same or declined slightly from Fall 2021 to Spring 2022. We also noticed a up and down pattern from Fall to Winter to Spring across subjects and multiple grade levels.

Based on the 21-22 FSA ELA: 3rd grade 47%, 4th grade 49% and 5th grade 58% proficiency. Math FSA: 3rd grade 67%, 4th grade 53%. and 5th grade 60% proficiency. Our only decrease from 20-21 was in 4th grade from 63% to 53% in Math and from 50% to 49% in ELA.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on Spring 2022 MAP data we see the need to improve Fourth grade ELA proficiency and Second/ Fourth grade Math proficiency.

ELA FSA: 3 grade and 4th grade proficiency % needs to increase

Math FSA: 4th grade proficiency % needs to increase

Based on cycle 2 District Science assessment every grade level was in a range of 65-84% proficiency:

1st- 84%, 2nd-71%, 3rd-66%, 4th-65%, 5th-70%
subgroups: multi/SWD

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

The problem/gap is occurring because of standards not being mastered/retained in previous grade levels and challenges with specific and targeted planning for individual students.

Focus professional development on the deconstructing of the B.E.S.T Standards in all grade levels and provide lesson planning development support for differentiation in core and small group lessons.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Overall MAP increases from Fall 2021 to Spring 2022:

2nd grade ELA increased from 58% to 65%

3rd grade ELA increased from 59% to 62%

4th grade ELA increased from 51% to 59%

2nd grade Math increased from 41% to %48

3rd grade Math increased from 52% to 64%

Overall FSA increases from 2020-2021 to 2021-2022:

3 grade ELA from 42% to 47%

3rd grade math from 48% to 67%

5th grade math from 57% to 60%

5th grade Science from 47% to 61%

Subgroups: multi/SWD

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

Contributing factors were intentional standards based planning, accelerating in small groups and a science boot camp .

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

We will determine the critical skills and concepts that students are missing and provide scaffolds that will bridge gaps while teaching the missing skills: intentional scaffolding in core, build knowledge and vocabulary bases, prioritize standards, modify small groups, provide text sets and provide opportunities for student collaboration.

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.

Professional development will occur in staff and grade level specific PLCs to address: grade level mastery of BEST Standards, diagnosing essential missed learning, prioritizing standards, how to scaffold in core and small groups, and providing collaboration opportunities throughout each academic block.

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

Professional development will be provided on the BEST Standards in ELA and Math across the grade levels and evidenced best practices for all staff working with students in grades K-5.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on the 21-22 ELA FSA our overall level of proficiency was 54%. We expect our level of proficiency to increase on the FAST in 22-23 to 60%- 3rd grade: 47%, 4th grade: 49%, 5th grade 58%
 The problem/gap is occurring because of standards not being mastered in previous grade levels.

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

Overall we expect our level of proficiency to increase from 51% to 60% as measured on the 22-23 FAST assessment.

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

We will monitor through lesson plans, module assessments, MAP, RR, ISIP and FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marie Brainard (brainardm@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1-Gain a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.
 2-Monitor whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block to ensure instruction in both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to research-based principles. •

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

1- Instructional staff need continued professional development time deconstructing the B.E.S.T Standards
 2- Administrative walk-through and observation feedback indicate a greater need for consistent evidence-based instructional practices to increase the number of students meeting proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- 1-The SBLT will meet at the start of the year to review 2022 FSA ELA data and Spring 2022 MAP data to identify students needing intervention within the MTSS process. The MTSS Coach will meet with teachers to review class data and recommend instructional and intervention support.
- 2-Based on data, students in grades K-5 will receive tier 2 ELA interventions: Project 23 for students K-3
- 3- Continue to use frequent progress monitoring data to identify students not meeting benchmark, including targeted instruction to eliminate gaps early.

Person Responsible

Marie Brisson (brissonm@pcsb.org)

- 4- Grade level teams will meet to become familiar with the vertical progression and BEST standards design in order to understand what students are expected to master.
- 5-Teachers will be provided lesson plan support by Administration and MTSS Coach in PLCs and planning periods. Teachers will intentionally plan for differentiation of whole group and small group lessons based on research based principals, continuing with an acceleration mindset.

Person Responsible

Marie Brainard (brainardm@pcsb.org)

6-- Administration and MTSS Coach will provide support and feedback focused on explicit, systematic and sequential approaches to reading instruction including a gradual release of responsibility model of instruction.

7- Teachers will ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data

Person Responsible Marie Brainard (brainardm@pcsb.org)

8- Utilize AVID strategies within ELA lessons: including learning log, Quick Writes, annotating the text, creating one pagers, reflection prompts.

9- Implement a systematic AVID goal setting process based on data and teacher feedback

Person Responsible Marie Brainard (brainardm@pcsb.org)

10- Teachers in grades 1-5 will utilize the PCS Connects 1:1 initiative to deliver integrated core lessons and increase time on Station, MyOn

Person Responsible Catherine Krajnik (krajnikc@pcsb.org)

11-Conduct parent conferences at least one per semester to provide updated progress and strategies for home

12-Provide a family training session on grade level strategies to improve reading.

Person Responsible Marie Brainard (brainardm@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on the 21-22 Math FSA our level of proficiency was 62%. We expect our level of proficiency to increase to 65% as measured by the FAST in grades 3-5.
 The problem/gap is occurring because of standards not being mastered/retained in previous grade levels and a lack of math fact fluency.

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

Overall we will increase the percentage of students meeting proficiency in grades 3-5 from 60% to 65% in Math as measured on the 2022-2023 FAST

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

Math achievement will be monitored by unit assessments, Dream Box reports, Reflex reports, FAST.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marie Brainard (brainardm@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1- Gain a deep understanding of the Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards for Mathematics as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.
 2-Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

1- 1- Instructional staff need continued professional development time deconstructing the B.E.S.T Standards
 2- Administrative walk-through and observation feedback indicate a greater need for consistent evidence-based instructional practices to increase the number of students meeting proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- 1-The SBLT will meet at the start of the year to review 2022 FSA Math data and Spring 2022 MAP data to identify students needing intervention within the MTSS process. The MTSS Coach will meet with teachers to review class data and recommend instructional and intervention support.
- 2-Based on data, students in grades K-5 will receive tier 2 Math interventions: Project 23 for students K-3
- 3- Continue to use frequent progress monitoring data to identifying students not meeting benchmark, including targeted instruction to eliminate gaps early.

Person Responsible

Marie Brisson (brissonm@pcsb.org)

- 4-Teachers and administrators engage in Just-in-Time Content PD to support Implementation of the B.E.S.T. Standards and other instructional initiatives to synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.
- 5- Ensure feedback, professional development, and PLC's support the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards and promote strong alignment between standard, target and task.
- 6-Utilize administrator walkthrough tools to provide weekly feedback to individual teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff.

Person Responsible

Amanda Wahl (wahlam@pcsb.org)

7-Classroom teachers will ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and intervention, based on data, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced tasks for students above benchmark
8-Classroom teachers will use instructional practices and routines that promote student-centered learning (Higher-Order Questioning, Pinellas Problem Solving Routine, Collaborative structures,)
9- Administration will provide just in time feedback through: iObservation, face to face, conferences, emails, handwritten notes

Person Responsible

Marie Brainard (brainardm@pcsb.org)

10-Classroom teachers will continue to implement an incentive program to increase math fluency across all grade levels: MOOVE Those Facts-Implement an incentive program to increase Dream box completed lessons among the grade levels and REFLEX Math in grades 2-5. Grade 2 will increase Dreambox lesson expectation to 7 lessons second semester.

Person Responsible

LaSherra Clutter (clutterl@pcsb.org)

11- Utilize AVID strategies within Math lessons: including focused note taking, journal entries, reflection prompts and learning logs

12-Implement a systematic AVID goal setting: revise goal sheet to include Dream Box, Reflex math

Person Responsible

Marie Brisson (brissonm@pcsb.org)

13- All 1-5 grade students will be assigned a device per the 1:1 PCS Connects initiative to integrate into core lessons and increase time on math programs: Dream Box, Reflex math.

Person Responsible

Catherine Krajnik (krajnikc@pcsb.org)

14- Conduct parent conferences at least one per semester to provide updated progress and strategies for home

15-Provide a family training session on grade level strategies to improve math fluency and competency

Person Responsible

Marie Brainard (brainardm@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on the 21-22 Science SSA our level of proficiency was 61%. We expect our level to increase to 70% as measured on the 2022-2023 Science SSA in grade 5. The problem/gap is occurring because of standards not being mastered/retained in previous grade levels.

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

We will increase our Science proficiency from 61% to 70% as measured on the Science SSA in 2022-2023.

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

Science achievement will be measured using District assessments and diagnostics, unit assessments and the Science SSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Wahl (wahlam@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1-Gain a deep understanding of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes
 2-Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

1- Continue to deepen understanding of prerequisite standards and how to integrate missed learning
 2- Administrative walk-through and observation feedback indicate a greater need for consistent evidence-based instructional practices (3-1 daily model, inquiry, collaboration) to increase the number of students meeting proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- 1- The SBLT will meet at the start of the year to review the 21-22 SSA data, 3-4 Diagnostic data from 21-22 and the cycle 1/2 assessment data form 21-22 for grades 1-5.
- 2- We will use the results of the 21-22 3-5 grade diagnostic data to create an action plan by September 2022

Person Responsible Marie Brainard (brainardm@pcsb.org)

- 3- Grade level PLCs will synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and content limits to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards and what students will need to master at grade level.
- 4-Cross grade levels will engage in standards articulation to gain a deeper understanding of prior knowledge and future learning to support students' holistic understanding of the Big Ideas in science.

Person Responsible Amanda Wahl (wahlam@pcsb.org)

- 5-Classroom teachers will implement instructional practices that result in students doing the work of the lesson (higher-order questioning, quick demonstration followed by practice, limiting teacher talk, high-quality feedback, and opportunities to use that feedback).
- 6-Classroom teachers will utilize the 3-I daily instructional routine (Ignite-Investigate-Inform instruction) to

ensure daily science lessons are presented as a whole while monitoring student understanding through the use of informal data collection.

Person Responsible Amanda Wahl (wahlam@pcsb.org)

7-Classroom teachers and MTSS will make certain instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond, small group instruction based on data, review of previously taught benchmarks as well as preview of upcoming benchmarks.

Person Responsible Marie Brisson (brissonm@pcsb.org)

8-Administration will use the administrator walkthrough tool to provide weekly feedback to individual teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices in science that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff.

9- Administration will provide just in time feedback through: iObservation, face to face, conferences, emails, handwritten notes

Person Responsible Marie Brainard (brainardm@pcsb.org)

10- Utilize AVID strategies within Science lessons: including focused note taking, journal entries, reflection prompts and learning logs

11-Implement a systematic AVID goal setting for formative and unit assessments.

Person Responsible Marie Brisson (brissonm@pcsb.org)

12- All 1-5 grade students will be assigned a device per the 1:1 PCS Connects initiative to integrate into core lessons and increase time on inquiry, gaming

Person Responsible Catherine Krajnik (krajnikc@pcsb.org)

13-Conduct parent conferences at least one per semester to provide updated progress and strategies for home

14-Provide a family training session on grade level strategies to improve science knowledge and science projects.

Person Responsible Marie Brainard (brainardm@pcsb.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 21-22 ELA FSA our level of proficiency was 51%. Our Students with Disabilities scored 30% on the Federal Percent of Points Index.
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. The problem/gap is occurring due to our SWD having a lack of foundational reading/writing skills.

Measurable Outcome: We will increase the percentage of students with disabilities meeting or exceeding proficiency on the 22-23 state assessment from 30% to 50% as measured on the ESSA Federal Index
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring: School Based Leadership will monitor all SWD progress monitoring data: module assessments, AIMS Web, District assessments
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marie Brisson (brissonm@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will instruct students with disabilities in foundational skills necessary to engage in rigorous, grade level content.
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We believe if classroom teachers and ESE teachers collaboratively plan specially designed instruction, aligned to the students' IEPs, students will receive the foundations necessary to successfully respond to rigorous instruction across all content.
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- 1-The ESE teachers will meet with classroom teachers, Administration and MTSS Coach in August 2022 to identify individual students with disabilities and their IEP goals: create a chart for scheduled reviews of data and services.
- 2-Based on IEP goals research based practices for students with disabilities will be built into all core instruction, evidenced on lesson plans: ELA/Math/Science
- 3-Collaboratively plan specific strategies into core to teach students critical memory and engagement processes they can use to access, retain and generalize content. Provide coaching if necessary.

Person Responsible Marie Brainard (brainardm@pcsb.org)

- 4- Coordinate and assign research based interventions aligned to IEP goals
- 5- Progress monitor (intervals based on subjects) to determine if making progress towards IEP goals are being met. Adjust services based on data reflections.

Person Responsible Marie Brisson (brissonm@pcsb.org)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our level of performance for our Black subgroup is 41% in ELA, as measured by the Federal Percent of Point Index in 21-22.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect our performance level to increase from 41% to 56% as measured on the Federal Percent of Point Index in ELA by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor by module assessments, intervention progress monitoring data and FAST progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marie Brisson (brissonm@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers will plan and implement culturally relevant instructional strategies (following the 6 M's model) in the classroom while partnering with families and building quality relationships.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We have seen learning gains based on implementing cultural relevant teaching strategies and nurturing quality relationships with students and families.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- 1- In school PLCs we will review best practices to align to culturally relevant practices.
- 2- Classroom teachers will collaboratively plan to incorporate the 6 M Model to increase engagement and motivations as a result of professional development by the school based Equity team.

Person Responsible

Marie Brainard (brainardm@pcsb.org)

- 3-Administrators will monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth.
- 4-Students will be targeted and prioritized for ELP opportunities.
- 5-Students will goal set within the AVID program

Person Responsible

Marie Brainard (brainardm@pcsb.org)

- 6- Teachers will analyze module assessments, intervention data and FAST data in grade PLCs to pinpoint areas of need for individual students.
- 7-Students will be given opportunities for problem solving and discussion among peers.

Person Responsible

Marie Brisson (brissonm@pcsb.org)

- 8- Teachers will collaborate with the Equity team and RP facilitator for equitable and restorative practices to enhance engagement.
- 9-Students will be monitored through ELFAC, module assessments, intervention data and FAST progress monitoring.
- 10- Data analysis by teachers, administration and the MTSS Coach will show if adjustments need to be made to Core, small group instruction and interventions

Person Responsible

Marie Brisson (brissonm@pcsb.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

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 and feedback

Work with grade level PLCs to ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the K-2 B.E.S.T. ELA Standards and to increase teacher knowledge of the science of reading & evidence-based practices. Provide and participate in ongoing professional development on the implementation of the high-quality curricular materials, analyze student work, and provide actionable feedback to teachers. Continue to monitor students not meeting benchmark in the early grades, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to eliminate gaps early.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

1-Classroom teachers will gain a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Grade level teams will meet to become familiar with the vertical progression and BEST standards design in order to understand what students are expected to master.

2-Monitor whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block to ensure instruction in both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to research-based principles.

Teachers will ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Each grade level will use the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system where at least 50% will be on track to pass the ELA state assessment in grades 3-5.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Each 3-5 grade will score at least 50% on the state ELA assessment in May 2023

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

We will use the following data to progress monitor: student, teacher and school. We will also use student work, teacher/district assessment and administrative walkthrough trend data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brainard, Marie, brainardm@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Administration will monitor reading and wiring core instruction as well as small group, to ensure it is being implemented as designed based on research based principals with rigorous target/tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T Standards

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The problem/gap is occurring because core and small group instruction is not being implemented with the use of research based principals and tasks are not aligned with rigor of the standard. If the task and target are aligned to the rigor of the B.E.S.T Standards then the problem will be reduced by 5%.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|--|
| Provide Literacy Leadership through staff and grade level PLCs to ensure K-2/3-5 staff have a clear understanding of the B.E.S.T Standards. Administration and members of the Leadership team will attend professional development on the B.E.S.T Standards for primary and intermediate. The Leadership team will meet to review school improvement goals and actions steps for a clear understanding of our Literacy focus. | Brainard, Marie, brainardm@pcsb.org |
| Provide professional learning within grade level PLCs and collaborative planning: B.E.S.T Standards deconstruction, effective strategies to accelerate learning, an emphasis on writing within all subjects and on going monitoring with actional feedback. | Brisson, Marie, brissonm@pcsb.org |
| Review all ELA progress monitoring and assessments immediately to address reallocation of resources, adjustments to planning and interventions. | Brisson, Marie, brissonm@pcsb.org |

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Northwest tries to promote a culture of positive beliefs, family/customer friendly interactions and equitable and restorative practices, while ensuring student achievement is a priority. We believe in transparency and doing our best to communicate to all stakeholders. We provide a variety of communication styles: agenda planners, monthly newsletters, school website, in person meetings, emails, school messenger, parent conferences. To ensure parents have current and relevant information and knowledge of the curriculum we provide training workshops in all content areas. We have regularly scheduled SAC/PTA meetings to impart information and gain input. We continue to promote a family friendly school within the safety guidelines. We implement a school wide behavior (SWB) system aligned to PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports). We use a 10 point system daily to track behavior. Students are acknowledged for making good choices weekly and monthly. We believe in being proactive by teaching expectations at the start of the year, we approach behavior like academics, it needs to be taught for desired outcomes: based on the CASEL and PBIS frameworks. All our students receive social skills instruction the first 4-6 weeks of school to ensure they have strategies to interact with their peers in a respectful positive manner. Student misbehavior is addressed using equitable and restorative practices. If students have additional needs their teacher submits a Support Request for support to the MTSS Team. The Student Service Team will provide tier 2/tier 3 interventions to help them be successful. We have built a partnership with Operation PAR to address the individual emotional needs of students. We have a 5:1 campaign which promotes 5 positive comments/compliments for each negative comment per individual. Administration works to sustain a positive collaborative culture within the staff community by scheduling and attending weekly PLCs to discuss content, analyze data, goal-set and provide professional development. Administration also continues to sustain a strong and positive moral by rewarding perfect monthly attendance, acknowledging a job well done, going above and beyond and promoting teacher leaders. As of May 2022 we had 91 referrals, an increase of 9 referrals from May 2021 of 82 referrals, as indicated in Focus. DATA-We had 36 students receiving the 91 referrals: 25 students had 1 referral, five students had 2, four students had 3, one student had 5, one student had 15, and one student had 25. Those last two students made up 44% of our referrals. 36% of students receiving referrals were ESE, which is a decrease of 32 percentage points from last year. (22% are in the EBD program). From the 91 referrals, the top three offenses are: striking an adult or peer (43% received by 11 students), classroom disruptions (20% received by 11 students) and fighting (14% received by 12 students). MEASURABLE OUTCOME-We will reduce the percentage of referrals for striking from 43% to 15% as measured in focus in May 2023. We will monitor monthly in PLC's, as well as SBLT and MTSS meetings. EVIDENCE-BASED STRATEGY- Expectations, social skills, and behavior strategies will be clearly defined, taught and retaught according to a schedule throughout the year. ACTION STEPS-1. MTSS process will be implemented to determine the individual needs and supports for students not maintaining 80% of their daily points: tier 2 interventions, PBIP, FBA.2. The PBIS team will provide training for all staff in PBIS, Restorative Practices and the MTSS Process during pre-school, as well as booster sessions throughout the year and new staff when needed.3. Teachers will use PBIS Guidelines for Success lesson plans to teach school and classroom expectations in the beginning of the year and then once weekly

with booster sessions after long weekends and holidays. 4. Teachers will follow a pre-determined schedule for proactive circles, 3 times per week, including skill lessons using Second Step and Student Success Skills, focusing heavily on topics related to physical aggression (conflict resolution, self-control...)5. Teachers and Administrators will address behaviors through a restorative lens and reteach low level behaviors as necessary, utilizing Restorative Practice Checklists to ensure circles and RP conferences are held with fidelity. 6. A system of recognition is in place to recognize and reward students demonstrating appropriate behaviors identified through our school-wide rules and expectations' matrix. Student data is tracked through the 10 point system with an average of 80%+ per week/ month.

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

The Northwest school staff is instrumental in creating the foundation of a positive school culture through: their daily welcoming of students, parents and visitors upon entering the campus and in their classrooms, building caring relationships with their students and families, providing extended learning opportunities for students, integrating their children's cultures into the curriculum, understanding their social emotional needs and providing resources when necessary. Northwest students contribute to a positive school culture by being motivated and engaged in learning on a daily basis. Students have respectful and positive interactions with staff which contribute to sustaining relationships. Students exhibit behaviors which promote a safe and positive learning environment within our PBIS program. Students contribute to the safety and welfare of the school by taking leadership roles as a Safety Patrol or being a member of the SAVE Club. Parents and community members contribute through their respectful interactions with staff and students when entering the campus. Parents work with staff to ensure their children are engaging with the school and curriculum. Parents collaborate with teachers/staff in conferences, family events and weekly lunch opportunities. Parents and community members also work with staff on volunteer opportunities, family event coordination, PTA and SAC committees to create a welcoming and positive school environment for all. We work with the community to transition our VPK students to Kindergarten and our Fifth graders to Middle school. We hold 2 parent workshops to share the Kindergarten curriculum and a day in the life of a Kindergarten at Northwest. We also schedule middle school articulation assemblies for Fifth graders with our feeder school counselors. We continue to promote volunteer and mentoring opportunities and experiences: parents, grandparents, former teachers, mentors, Lawyers for Literacy program. We are fortunate to have a business partnership with Raytheon. They have supported back to school supplies and Christmas gifts for families. We continue to work with the local colleges by providing internship opportunities for future educators.