

Pinellas County Schools

Campbell Park Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Campbell Park Elementary School

1051 7TH AVE S, St Petersburg, FL 33705

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

Demographics

Principal: Kathleen Young Parker

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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 Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: F (30%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Campbell Park Elementary School

1051 7TH AVE S, St Petersburg, FL 33705

<http://www.campbell-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	94%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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 Campbell Park Elementary is to create a high-performing school that produces scholars that are critical thinkers, excellent communicators and globally competitive in an international and technical society.

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
Young, Kathleen	Principal	Oversees the school, Oversees the ILT, facilitates PD, MTSS process, Oversees all budgets, SAC, PTA, Family engagement, CST, Teacher evaluations, and walkthroughs, facilitates the School Leadership Team and the Instructional leadership team
Noorbakhsh, Kim	Assistant Principal	Learning Specialist, PBIS Coordinator, Safety and Operations Manager, instructional walkthroughs, teacher evaluation, testing coordinator, Oversees MTSS and CST, ILT facilitator.
Hires, Megan	Math Coach	Math PD, Math planning with teachers, developing math assessments, Monitoring math block, Math ILT, instructional walkthroughs, math intervention block, analyzing math data
McPherson, Kara	Reading Coach	ELA PD, ELA planning with teachers, developing ELA assessments, Monitoring ELA block, ELA ILT, instructional walkthroughs, ELA intervention block, analyzing ELA data, site-based lead mentor.
Trippett, Kelly	Science Coach	Science coaching, science lab manager, planning and modeling lessons in science, analyzing science data, science after school program.
Soto, Amy	Instructional Coach	MTSS Process, Title One Audit, assists with testing, monitors achievement gap data. Will work closely with our school educational diagnostician, psychologist, and guidance counselor to provide supports for and monitor our Tier II and III scholars.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Kathleen Young Parker

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

372

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

5

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

4

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	45	92	65	75	52	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	374
Attendance below 90 percent	4	63	36	49	30	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	8	7	12	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	4	9	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/20/2022

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	39	77	85	84	53	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	428
Attendance below 90 percent	0	40	63	51	31	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	243
One or more suspensions	0	0	11	3	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
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	6	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	25	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	12	44	21	33	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160

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	1	17	13	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	2	8	8	6	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	39	77	85	84	53	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	428
Attendance below 90 percent	0	40	63	51	31	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	243
One or more suspensions	0	0	11	3	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
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	6	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	25	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	12	44	21	33	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160

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	1	17	13	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	2	8	8	6	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	25%	55%	56%				31%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						58%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	89%						74%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	28%	51%	50%				35%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	58%						45%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	74%						49%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	29%	62%	59%				26%	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	28%	56%	-28%	58%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	32%	56%	-24%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2022					
	2019	20%	54%	-34%	56%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

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	39%	62%	-23%	62%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	29%	64%	-35%	64%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2022					
	2019	21%	60%	-39%	60%	-39%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	19%	54%	-35%	53%	-34%
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	38	62	80	39	67		32				
BLK	24	54	88	25	58	72	31				
WHT	43			71							
FRL	23	53	92	26	55	70	29				
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	32	32		36	44		33				
BLK	19	35	53	17	28	32	27				
WHT	23			50							
FRL	18	36	59	19	34	36	28				
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	37	60	75	40	61	71	39				
BLK	30	56	72	32	44	49	23				
WHT	41	79		59	69						
FRL	29	56	74	34	45	48	23				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
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?

In ELA, we noticed that students lacked foundational skills which limited their access to complex level text sets. We also noticed that in Mathematics, our students lacked a solid foundation in number sense/early numeracy skills which hindered them from performing basic computation (basic facts).

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

The area of ELA proficiency demonstrated the greatest need for improvement.

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 contributing factor(s) for low ELA performance include ELA foundational gaps in grades 3-5 students and inconsistent use of data to plan for differentiation and scaffold instruction to increase student achievement.

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

Based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, L25 ELA students showed the most improvement jumping an average of 36%.

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

This growth is contributed to the fluid math small groups created by the assistant principal, math coach, and classroom teachers.

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

Classroom teachers and interventionists will implement a plan to identify students not meeting the benchmark, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitor progress to ameliorate early gaps.

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

We will continue to integrate data analysis and chats during PLCs, training with McGraw Math, iReady, and ELA Champions, and curriculum training from the Administrative Team.

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

We will continue providing targeted and tailored professional development that deep dives into data, improving instruction based on assessment data, working with content area coaches to best implement standards-based instruction with a focus on student-centered learning with rigor, integrating Restorative Practices, Social-Emotional Learning, Positive Behavior Intervention Systems, Culturally Relevant Teaching, and Equity Best Practices in all content areas.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Standards-based data (FSA, common assessments, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning.

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

Measurable

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

Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 10% (from 20% to 30%), as measured by district and state assessments.

Proficiency in Mathematics will increase 10% (from 26% to 36%), as measured by district and state assessments.

Proficiency in Science will increase 10% (from 29% to 39%), as measured by district and state assessments.

Black student proficiency in ELA/Math/Science will increase 10% (from 20% to 30%), as measured by district and state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be monitored through ILT meetings, walk-throughs, and bi-weekly data chats with teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen Young (young-parkerk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based

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

1. Utilize curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.

2. Develop a professional learning plan that results in improved practice and better student outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

In order to provide students opportunities to engage in grade-appropriate standards-based tasks teachers will be supported through a structure for professional learning communities focused on effective teaching methods for learning.

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. Utilize curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.

- Orient to and implement the instructional materials, understanding how the materials connect to evidence-based practices and B.E.S.T. Standards/NGSSS.
- Provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark.
- Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark.
- 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.
- Employ 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).
- Implement a plan to identify students not meeting benchmark in the early grades, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitor progress to ameliorate early gaps.

Person Responsible Kathleen Young (young-parkerk@pcsb.org)

2. Develop a professional learning plan that results in improved practice and better student outcomes.

- Teachers and administrators engage in the just-in-time training they need to support the implementation of the curriculum and other instructional initiatives already underway.
- Ensure professional development is content-focused, teacher and student-focused, instructionally relevant, and actionable.
- Provide regular structures for planning/PLCs where teachers regularly engage in data/student work analysis as well as intellectual prep & lesson rehearsal for upcoming lessons, including scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.
- Regularly collaborate as a leadership team to engage in meaningful discussions and collective goal-setting around improving student outcomes including, but not limited to teacher support, community outreach, and strengthening a culture of high expectations for all students.
- Engage in professional development on various aspects of differentiation.

Person Responsible Kathleen Young (young-parkerk@pcsb.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

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

Due to the lack of inclusion structures where the Gen-ed and VE Resource teachers collaboratively team-teach to provide differentiation. If both, Gen-ed and VE Resource teachers consistently utilize data to plan for differentiation and scaffold instruction to increase the achievement of SWD, the problem/gap would be reduced by closing the achievement gap between our ESE and non-ESE students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD proficiency in ELA will increase 10% (from 19% to 29%), as measured by district and state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be monitored through ILT meetings, walk-throughs, and bi-weekly data chats with teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen Young (young-parkerk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Instruct students with disabilities in foundational skills necessary to engage in rigorous, grade-level content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Instruct students with disabilities in foundational skills necessary to engage in rigorous, grade-level content

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.

- Provide instruction that is aligned to the student’s IEP goals and specially designed to meet the student’s unique needs.
- Use evidence-based practices for students with disabilities to teach foundational literacy and math skills.
- Make rigorous texts, materials, content, and activities accessible to students through supplementary aids including assistive technology.
- Embed strategies into content-based instruction to teach students critical memory and engagement processes they can use to access, retain, and generalize important content.
- Provide multiple opportunities for students to engage in and respond to instruction using their primary

mode of communication, which may include the use of augmentative or alternative communication systems or visual supports and other prompts to support student success.

- Collect data and monitor progress towards IEP goals and objectives on an intentional and regular schedule. Adjust services and accommodations if supported by data.

Person Responsible Kathleen Young (young-parkerk@pcsb.org)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance

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

Scholar attendance was selected due to data pulled during the 2021-22 school year, 61% of our scholars were present less than 90% of the instructional school year.

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

The rate of chronic absence 10% and chronic absence 20% will decrease by 10%, as measured by attendance data in Focus.

Chronic Absence 10% from an average of 61% to 51% or less.
 Chronic Absence 20% from an average of 28% to 18% or less.

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

Child Study Team (CST) meetings weekly to utilize the problem-solving worksheet for grade level attendance. The Social Worker/ Attendance will conduct home visits and parent conferences with families who have chronic absences and/or tardies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Noorbakhsh (noorbakhshk@pcsb.org)

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

Create a three-tiered approach that starts with foundational support for the whole school. These foundational supports are followed by prevention-oriented supports (Tier1), more personalized outreach (Tier 2), and intensive intervention (Tier 3).

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

Missing more than 10% of school in one school year puts the scholar at risk for retention. Strengthening the Tiered process will build stronger relationships between the schools and families while helping to identify barriers that are attributed to chronic absences.

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.

- Strengthen the implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III attendance interventions to address and support the needs of our scholars.
- Child Study Team will meet weekly to review and discuss Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
- Child Study Team and School-Based Leadership Team will review and problem-solve around attendance data on a monthly basis.
- Attendance Specialist and Social Worker will continue providing parents with district populated letters informing parent/guardian(s) of their child's attendance as well as hold parent conferences, conduct home visits, and/or refer families with chronic attendance issues to the State Attorney's Office.
- Continue offering services from the Suncoast Counselor and Family Navigator as well as other community resources to address and/or eliminate attendance barriers.

Person Responsible Kim Noorbakhsh (noorbakhshk@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

Gain a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

K-2 students that are on track for level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment is 35%.

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

Gain a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T./NGSSS Standards as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

3-5 students that are on track for level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment is 20%.

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)

Proficiency in K-2 English Language Arts will increase 10% (from 35% to 45%), as measured by district and state assessments.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Proficiency in 3-5 English Language Arts will increase 10% (from 20% to 30%), as measured by district and state assessments.

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.

Data will be monitored through ILT meetings, walk-throughs, and bi-weekly data chats with teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Noorbakhsh, Kim, noorbakhshk@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?

- Data Chats of school-wide, district, and state assessments in a timely manner.
- Data-driven decisions making, derived from data chats.
- Coaching Cycles
- Professional Development
- University of Florida Lastinger Flamingo Small Group Model.

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?

Based on MAP and FSA data there is a majority of scholars in K-5 are not proficient in ELA. These practices are researched based and proven to increase proficiency.

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 regular structures for planning/PLCs where teachers regularly engage in data/ student work analysis as well as intellectual prep and lesson rehearsal for upcoming lessons, including scaffolds that address gaps in student learning (using various methods such as lesson study, peer-to-peer observations, fishbowl). Data analysis protocols will be implemented to analyze various assessments (iReady, ELFAC, and other progress monitoring assessments).	Noorbakhsh, Kim, noorbakhshk@pcsb.org
Utilize administrator walkthrough tools to provide weekly feedback to individual teachers and communicate and highlight evidence-based practices impacting student achievement with the entire staff.	Noorbakhsh, Kim, noorbakhshk@pcsb.org
Engage in ongoing professional development on the implementation of high-quality curricular materials, including morning walks for excellence, study student responses, and robust and constructive feedback.	Noorbakhsh, Kim, noorbakhshk@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.

At Campbell Park, our philosophy is to foster and promote a safe and positive school environment that enhances student learning through teaching and recognizing positive behaviors. Our ultimate goal is to maintain a school climate where students, families, and staff feel appreciated, safe, and respected.

This culture and environment will be built by:

- Setting a clear vision, school norms, goals, and expectations that support social, emotional, and physical safety

- Establishing school safety for a more positive climate
- Advocating for students as well as parent's involvement in school policies and practices
- Engaging teachers and administrators
- Setting boundaries through school and classroom rules
- Creating fun and positive experiences
- Creating a healthy physical, emotional, and social environment for student growth
- Improving your current school climate through assessments and surveys

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

We provide multiple opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback, participate, and/or learn about what is happening around our campus. We will utilize newsletters, School Messenger, class dojo, flyers, school website, marquee, and Facebook to inform families of upcoming meetings and events. Teachers communicate with families regarding standards and curriculum and curriculum information during monthly family nights. Parent-teacher conferences, as well as student-led conferences, occur to provide families with information on proficiency levels students are expected to meet. We survey families annually.

We know neighborhood and community partnerships are key to our school's success. We are a proud partner in the Executive PASS Partnerships. This partnership has paired our school with several businesses throughout Pinellas County such as Kanes Furniture and the Urban League. We also have strong partnerships with the Cathedral Church of St. Peters, Calvary Chapel, Jabil, and the Rays.