

Pinellas County Schools

Sutherland 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Sutherland Elementary School

3150 N BELCHER RD, Palm Harbor, FL 34683

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

Demographics

Principal: Kristy Cantu L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2011

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (71%) 2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (70%)
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	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Sutherland Elementary School

3150 N BELCHER RD, Palm Harbor, FL 34683

<http://www.sutherland-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	No	43%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A	A	A	A

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 Sutherland family works together to provide a successful, quality education in a safe learning environment to prepare each student for college, career and life.

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
Cantu, Kristy	Principal	The duties include but are not limited to promoting and maintaining high student achievement by shaping a vision of academic success for all students, providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school operations, ensuring a safe learning environment, cultivating leadership in others and maintaining a school climate that is supportive to the needs of staff, students and families.
Mazur, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Bengston, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional supports and data monitoring.
Conforti-Friedman, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional supports and data monitoring.
Sparkman, Aimee	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional supports and data monitoring.
Grandmaison, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional supports and data monitoring.
Matthews, Danielle	School Counselor	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional supports and data monitoring.
Hurton, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Knappins, Sabrina	Administrative Support	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/15/2011, Kristy Cantu L

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.*

9

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

628

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

6

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

6

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	85	102	125	112	88	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	583
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	5	8	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	15	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/7/2022

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	97	96	115	117	83	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	0	11	6	5	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	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	97	96	115	117	83	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	0	11	6	5	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	4	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	65%	55%	56%				78%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%						73%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						59%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	82%	51%	50%				86%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	85%						89%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	76%						83%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	62%	59%				80%	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	77%	56%	21%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	77%	56%	21%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	77%	54%	23%	56%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

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	74%	62%	12%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	92%	64%	28%	64%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2022					
	2019	91%	60%	31%	60%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	79%	54%	25%	53%	26%
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	30	43		70	71						
ELL	47	44		70	72						
BLK	50			42							
HSP	58	67		68	86		67				
WHT	66	66	48	86	83	65	80				
FRL	52	60	50	76	87	79	59				

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	36	40		68	80						
ELL	64	77		86	92		77				
BLK	30			60							
HSP	56			67							
WHT	74	73	75	82	89	88	81				
FRL	58	73	67	75	95	83	78				
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	66	74		79	84	83					
ELL	63	63	58	81	78						
HSP	76	62		85	95	91	70				
MUL	73			91							
WHT	79	75	65	86	88	81	81				
FRL	70	71	54	81	86	81	81				

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	69
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	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	548
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
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	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	46
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	69
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	
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	69
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	65
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?

As we analyzed our data, the strength in math performance continues to be strong. Our overall achievement, learning gains for all and learning gains for our L25 continue to trend upward. We increased our math performance in 3rd grade over previous years by 6 percentage points and our 5th grade math scores were the strongest. We had a large number of students reaching level 5 proficiency and we had fewer students score a level 1 in math than we did in ELA. Looking at our ELA data we had a large number of students scoring a Level 2. Science proficiency dropped significantly this year, however we feel there are factors outside of the teacher's control that contributed to this decline. Looking at data in Science across the district, most schools dropped in performance. Our weakest point continues to be our L25 students in ELA.

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

Through analysis of our data, ELA performance, both in proficiency levels and learning gains, continues to be the area in 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?

This past school year we had a high number of staff take a leave of absence for various reasons. In 4th grade, we implemented a departmentalized model based on our staffing coming into the school year. Unfortunately, a 4th grade ELA teacher had to take a leave of absence (a week before students began the school year) for the entire school year and we had to find a replacement. There were 2 long term substitutes that filled the vacancy, and despite the levels of support, the ELA proficiency and learning gains in 4th grade ELA declined immensely. Due to the teaming model, the number of students impacted by this change in staffing doubled. With the new school year we will have a stable staffing model with our grade levels fully staffed with highly qualified teachers. To support those students with low proficiency or who did not make learning gains, and are now entering 5th grade, we will provide extended learning opportunities to close the gaps that they have looking at the standards that were most lacking. We will also implement a walk to achievement model in 5th grade to bring in additional staffing support.

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

Through analysis of our data, we most improved in our math learning gains, including learning gains for our L25 students.

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

In 4th grade we moved to a teaming model and we have had that same model in 5th grade for many years. We intentionally placed teachers in those models based on strength of content knowledge, as well as their use of formative assessment to drive instruction. We also have teachers within both teams that act as math coaches to support the needs of our school, and provide support through collaborative planning and PLC's.

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

Deeper learning through complex and meaningful problems, projects and questioning techniques
Moving forward into grade-level content, with support
Determining the most efficient and effective way to help students experience grade-level learning based on where they are today
Access to grade-level content despite the absence of some knowledge and skills from previous grades
identifying the most crucial knowledge and skills that students need and integrating those into lessons
a long-range plan, building on a foundation of assets, not deficiencies
Scaffolding up, not down to build rigor

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.

With a revised and innovative school based professional development plan we are going to implement similar strategies that address adult learning theory to support teacher growth so they can accelerate student learning efficiently and effectively. Adults have varied learning needs much the same as our students. Providing PD to meet each adult learner where they are will allow us to accelerate teacher instructional growth. A needs assessment will be given in pre-school where teachers will have voice in what they feel their learning needs are. This, coupled with classroom and observation/evaluation data will be used to provide differentiated support. Some of the general topics will include the following:
~Use of Just in Time Coaching support based on teacher need
~Breaking down data to understand the foundational gaps that exist for students
~Teacher leaders will lead sessions on varied topics for teachers to self-select areas of need/interest
~Bring in district staff developer from the Gifted department to support teachers in planning for and writing high impact questions and how to scaffold content up
~Provide PD on how to analyze Running Record data and ELFAC data to form small group support that is better matched to student need

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

Continued implementation of 2 hourly interventionists for reading. Use of Read Across Pinellas Tutor K-1. Continued District support such as Just in Time Coaching and other staff developers.

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: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Standards-based data (FSA, MAP, walkthrough/observation data, etc) collected and reviewed from the 2021-2022 school year showed gaps in performance in all content areas. Not only were our L25 students underperforming, we also saw our talented and gifted students performance vacillate. Of course, looking across subgroups, these same trends emerged. After careful discussion and analysis of the data it was determined that students are not being provided with the opportunity to respond to questions that require deeper thinking and that we remain rooted in Level 1 and Level 2 questions/tasks no matter the standard. There is a lack of consistency in tasks/questions aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks and higher levels of questioning. Our current level of performance in ELA is 65% as measured by the 2022 FSA Our current level of performance in Math is 81% as measured by the 2022 FSA Our current level of performance in Science is 70% as measured by the 2022 NGSSS

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. The percentage of students achieving ELA proficiency of Level 3 or higher will be 80% The percentage of students achieving Math proficiency of Level 3 or higher will be 90% The percentage of students achieving Science proficiency of Level 3 or higher will be 85% Black student proficiency in ELA/Math/Science will increase 10% as measured by The above goals will be measured by the 2023 state approved standardized assessment.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. The Area of Focus will be monitored in the following ways:
 ~Administrative Walk-through and observation data
 ~MTSS review of district assessment data
 ~Grade Level data reviews
 ~Report Card grades

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being Teachers will gain a deeper understanding on how to plan and deliver lessons aligned to the B.E.S.T Standards/NGSSS to include criteria to push "elevate" questions higher, as well as align tasks to those standards.

implemented for this Area of Focus.

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

Students will increase proficiency when they are given the opportunity to respond to questions that go beyond the lower level of Webb's Depth of Knowledge to raise the rigor, as well as complete independent tasks that are tightly aligned to the rigor of the standards. With our current structures which include ELA Champions, Peer Coaches across content areas, and systematic timely and actionable feedback a culture of professional growth in our targeted areas will yield positive results.

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.

Become familiar with the design in order to understand what students are expected to master

Person Responsible Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Pre-test students in order to appropriately differentiate with leveled and tiered questions and/or tasks.

Person Responsible Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark.

Person Responsible Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Provide opportunity for teachers to intentionally plan questions and/or tasks that tightly align with the depth of the standard/benchmark.

Person Responsible Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Utilize the Depth and Complexity Framework.

Person Responsible Kimberly Hurton (hurtonk@pcsb.org)

Teachers will engage in site based, embedded professional development, as well as district provided PD with a lens on elevating questions and matching tasks to the standards.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Reorient teachers to the work with respect to adding criteria to push "elevate" questions by inviting the Gifted ISD to our campus to provide support through PLC's.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Analyze ELFAC and Running Record data to determine foundational skill gaps.

Person Responsible Kimberly Hurton (hurtonk@pcsb.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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

Standards-based data (FSA, MAP, walkthrough/observation data, etc) collected and reviewed from the 2021-2022 school year showed gaps in performance in all content areas. Not only were our L25 students underperforming in ELA, we also saw our talented and gifted students performance vacillate. Of course, looking across subgroups, these same trends emerged for our black students, male learners and ESE students. After careful discussion and analysis of the data it was determined that students are not being provided with the opportunity to respond to questions that require deeper thinking and that we remain rooted in Level 1 and Level 2 questions/tasks no matter the standard. There is a lack of consistency in tasks/questions aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Students of all subgroups are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks and higher levels of questioning.

Our current level of performance in ELA for our black students is 54%

Our current level of performance in ELA for our male learners is 65%

Our current level of performance in ELA for our ESE students is 26%

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

The percentage of students in each identified subgroup above achieving ELA proficiency of Level 3 or higher will be 70% , 80%, 70%

The above goals will be measured by the 2023 state approved standardized assessment.

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored in the following ways:

- ~Administrative Walk-through and observation data
- ~MTSS review of district assessment data
- ~Grade Level data reviews
- ~Report Card grades

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Hurton (hurtonk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy

Teachers will gain a deeper understanding on how to plan and deliver lessons aligned to the B.E.S.T Standards/NGSSS to include criteria to push "elevate" questions higher, as well as align tasks to those standards.

being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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

The students in each subgroup must have access to aligned, grade level standards both in the core learning environment and while engaging in intervention and enrichment groups across the many departments that service the varying needs of our student population. Students will increase proficiency when they are given the opportunity to respond to questions that go beyond the lower level of Webb's Depth of Knowledge to raise the rigor, as well as complete independent tasks that are tightly aligned to the rigor of the standards.

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.

Become familiar with the design in order to understand what students are expected to master

Person Responsible Kimberly Hurton (hurtonk@pcsb.org)

Pre-test students in order to appropriately differentiate with leveled and tiered questions and/or tasks.

Person Responsible Kimberly Hurton (hurtonk@pcsb.org)

Provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark.

Person Responsible Kimberly Hurton (hurtonk@pcsb.org)

Provide opportunity for teachers to intentionally plan questions and/or tasks that tightly align with the depth of the standard/benchmark.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Teachers will engage in site based, embedded professional development, as well as district provided PD with a lens on elevating questions and matching tasks to the standards.

Person Responsible Kimberly Hurton (hurtonk@pcsb.org)

Utilize Equity and Boy Champions within the school to deliver professional development (based on district provided modules and/or bookstudy)

Person Responsible Kimberly Hurton (hurtonk@pcsb.org)

Provide planning time for ESE teachers to collaboratively plan with general education teachers

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Behavior

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

Our current level of performance in school -wide behavior is 22 referrals. The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because students represented in this data lack appropriate social and academic skills to perform successfully in the classroom. If structures addressing behaviors and/or positive student relations are implemented school-wide, the problem would be reduced by creating classroom cultures that are responsive and inclusive of all learners academic and social needs as evidenced by a decrease in referral data and an increase in positive behavior recognition

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

We expect our number of referrals to decrease by 20% in all areas by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored using the following:
 ~Referral Data
 ~PBIS points
 ~Administrative walkthrough data
 ~MTSS Tiered data review based on behavior

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

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

Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students and create strong classroom communities. Strengthen the implementation of research-based best practices that communicate high expectations for each student. Support the development and/or implementation of school-wide ownership of equitable practices that engage students in acknowledging and adhering to processes and procedures

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

By establishing and maintaining positive relationships with all students, students will be more engaged and connected to their classroom environment which will decrease the opportunity for off-task and disruptive behavior. With a focus on structures addressing behaviors and/or positive student relationships students will receive fresh starts, equitable discipline and opportunity to

communicate their needs to a classroom teacher or other trusted adult on campus. An increased focus on equitable practices will proliferate an emotionally, intellectually and physically safe environment

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 Restorative Practices in all classrooms and less structured areas of the school (cafe, hallways etc).

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Support the implementation of engagement strategies that support the development of social and instructional teaching practices

Person Responsible Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Continue school-wide implementation of PBIS and monthly follow up with the school PBIS team

Person Responsible Kimberly Hurton (hurtonk@pcsb.org)

School-wide celebrations monthly (effort, citizenship, PBIS)

Person Responsible Kimberly Hurton (hurtonk@pcsb.org)

Professional Development with a focus on de-escalation of student behavior and appropriate positive interventions

Person Responsible Kristy Cantu (cantuk@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.

Building and maintaining a positive school culture is a large priority. Through our annual Climate Survey we are able to assess areas of strength and areas of challenge based on feedback. Ensuring that all stakeholders have a voice assists us in making intentional decisions that support the growth of our school culture and environment. We have fully implemented the PBIS model school wide, which has created a shift from a deficit mindset, to a positive strengths based mind set. The PBIS model also ensures that all students are recognized for positive behaviors, where our previous way of work primarily focused on students who were struggling with behavior. Through the feedback we received, it was evident that not all stakeholders felt a part of the larger system, and PBIS has closed that gap. We routinely ask for input through our various stakeholder groups throughout the school year to keep a pulse on morale and the barriers that may exist so we can address those needs systematically.

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

That feedback we receive is shared with our staff, School Advisory Council, and PTA to determine how to address need and enhance areas of strength. We also collaborate with our surrounding early childhood providers with respect to skills/strengths of rising Kindergarten students. Several events are held throughout the school year including but not limited to, Meet the Teacher, Open House, and Volunteer Orientation. Through these events, feedback is solicited on a variety of topics. Sutherland also hosts Level 3 interns from St. Petersburg College and the University of South Florida in which we give feedback to supervisors, on strengths/challenges of the current education program. Our PTA has formed several business partnerships to assist our efforts of finding mentors for our students. Our SAC and PTA are representative of our school community and share insights with respect to our School Improvement Plan, as well as other school-wide initiatives. Through our communication efforts (Social Media platforms, website, newsletters, school messenger etc.) we ensure that our stakeholders are made aware of school operations as they relate to supporting academic achievement, school safety, family and community partnerships and other imminent school information. Our school counselor provides classes and support to students, and has implemented a new student orientation so that all students feel welcome and supported.

As leaders, the Principal and Assistant Principal are accessible to students, staff, families and the community.

The Assistant Principal leads the school-wide PBIS program and has solicited support from our families and community members through donations of items, time and mentorship.