Sandy Lane Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sandy Lane Elementary School

1360 SANDY LN, Clearwater, FL 33755

http://www.sandylane-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Jeffrey Moss B

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: D (38%) 2017-18: D (38%)
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

Sandy Lane Elementary School

1360 SANDY LN, Clearwater, FL 33755

http://www.sandylane-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	86%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		D	D

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.

Promote scholars to dream, believe, and achieve their personal, academic, and social-emotional goals through the arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

Core Values: Respect, Diversity, Collective Efficacy, and Building a strong community where all students can learn.

Theme: Dream it, Believe it, Achieve it

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
Austin, Kelly	Principal	Oversee all operation and instructional decisions and monitor for effectiveness
Brewster, Julie	Assistant Principal	Oversee all operational and instructional decisions and monitor for effectivenss
Santana, Christine	Instructional Coach	Analyzes data and plans interventions in math and reading for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction; also leads PD on interventions and core instruction.
Rogers-Rush, Olivia	Reading Coach	Supports grade 3 - 5 ELA teachers in core and interventions.
Springer, Melissa	Math Coach	supports teachers in math core and interventions.
Rodriguez, Celimar	Science Coach	Leads the science curriculum and coaching school-wide.
Richardson, Pamela	Instructional Coach	Magnet coordinator and instructional coach for the arts program

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Jeffrey Moss B

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.*

0

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Total number of students enrolled at the school

300

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

12

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

11

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	59	69	55	65	35	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	334
Attendance below 90 percent	27	25	19	25	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	20	6	9	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
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	35	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	9	17	18	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	1	1	0	1	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	2	7	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/11/2022

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	56	73	62	70	37	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	357
Attendance below 90 percent	6	40	32	42	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	0	3	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	4	3	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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	56	73	62	70	37	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	357
Attendance below 90 percent	6	40	32	42	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	0	3	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	4	3	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	32%	55%	56%				28%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						44%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						39%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	44%	51%	50%				46%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	68%						45%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%						35%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	62%	59%				27%	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	30%	56%	-26%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	37%	56%	-19%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
05	2022					
	2019	22%	54%	-32%	56%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

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	55%	62%	-7%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	56%	64%	-8%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	32%	60%	-28%	60%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	27%	54%	-27%	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	17	58		24	70						
ELL											
BLK	22	58	53	38	67	86	29				
HSP	53			69							
MUL	20			30							
WHT	61	60		58	70						
FRL	32	54	50	43	67	68	37				
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	13	50		15	25						
ELL											
BLK	18	41		27	41	30	31				
HSP	14			50							
WHT	39	25		41	54		38				
FRL	23	37	46	29	41	33	30				
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	12	37	38	28	43	38	14				
ELL											
BLK	20	38	32	37	40	39	21				
HSP	43	67		61	53						
WHT	36	50		59	56		45				
FRL	26	44	40	45	47	41	24				

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	54
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	71
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	
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	64
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	25
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	54
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?

Across grade levels and content areas, learning gains were made in the 21/22 school year. While proficiency scores grew from 20/21 to 21/22, they continue to fall under 50% in ELA, Math, and Science. In regards to subgroups, there is a significant achievement gap between black students and non-black students in all grade levels and content areas, with the exception of the rising first grade class. The SWD subgroup has very few students proficient in any content area and any grade level.

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

Proficiency in both reading and math continue to be the area for greatest need. This is the case based on FSA, MAP, and Running Records.

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

There is a lack of foundational standard mastery and higher order, cognitive thinking tasks that students need in order to become more proficient. In order to address this need, all students who are not on grade level, will need a diagnostic administered in foundational skills for both reading and math. Then interventions need to be put in place that are strategic and prescriptive for each and every student. More frequent progress monitoring is needed in order to move forward as quickly as possible based on student growth on these foundational gaps. In the core instruction, adaptations are needed for specialized instruction, so the content is accessible at grade level and the thinking work required of the tasks requires DOK level 3 and 4 cognitive thinking. This will require intentional planning to build background knowledge, vocabulary, and an increase in writing tasks.

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

Learning gains showed the most improvement in both ELA (increase 21 points) and Math (increase 25 points) as measured by FSA data. The learning gains of the bottom quartile in math also had an increase of 32 points. As a result, proficiency in all 3 subject areas increased from 20/21 school year to 21/22

(Reading increased from 24 to 32, math increased from 32 to 44, and science from 30 to 40 percentage points).

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

In the core, instruction was done in small group in order to meet the needs of students and maintain engagement. During intervention, much differentiation occurred and first semester was dedicated to filling gaps and fluency. In addition, the school was very intentional with the iReady computer based work.

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

In order to accelerate learning in any subject area, students must become fluent readers. Comprehension should be built through shared reading, read alouds, and independent reading. Students also need to be taught how to closely read in order to make the inferences and synthesize the text beyond literal interpretation. This will support acceleration in all content areas.

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

1. Equity within the classroom.
2. Strong PBIS and processes/procedures, with high expectations for the conditions for learning.
3. Understand and apply the new BEST standards.
4. Understand the levels of reading acquisition so each and every student's needs are met and filled in all grade levels and all content areas: intensive and prescribed intervention blocks.
5. Fluency in both reading and math computation.
6. Comprehensive questioning in all content areas that requires a high level of cognitive thinking through writing.

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

1. Build autonomy with grade levels on collaborative planning, data analysis, and on the spot instructional changes based on the students' needs each day. Autonomy can only be built once teachers have a strong understanding of the standards and the task alignment.
2. Explicit foundational standards need to be mastered in K - 2 in order for students to move to third grade and beyond with the skills necessary to read and comprehend grade level content and apply it to tasks independently.

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.	2021/2022 showed a large increase in learning gains in grades 3 - 5 in ELA and Math. However, the proficiency scores are quite low in all grade levels and all subject areas. There is a significant gap for the Black and SWD subgroups. While students were provided with a variety of interventions and small group instruction, a prescriptive focus is needed on foundational standards, as well as, consistency in tasks aligned to the benchmark standards within core instruction. Teachers need to use effective teaching methods to support scholars in this work through strategic monitoring and using the results to drive their next move throughout each lesson of the day. The 22/23 school year brings a new principal, 60% new grade level classroom teachers, and 4 of 6 instructional coaches are new to Sandy Lane Elementary. With the majority of the staff new to the school, developing a way of work with the coaching staff and strategic professional development will be essential for continuous improvement. In addition, the state will be launching the BEST standards in the 22/23 school year and all new curriculum in ELA and math. It will be critical that administrators, coaches and teachers deeply understand the new standards, develop collaborative structures that use the standards, the curriculum, and use student data to make informed decisions on daily lessons. As teachers begin to teach their units of study, it will be essential they monitor throughout the lesson and make adjustments based on the understanding of the lesson and follow-up with small group to ensure all students reach mastery. Also, understanding by coaches/teachers will be needed in the foundational standards of both ELA and Math. This will be done through continued PD, data analysis, coaching cycles, and consistent, actionable feedback to grow each and every teacher in this area.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Proficiency in ELA and Math will increase by 10%, as measured by each grade level's assessment from the end of 21/22 FSA or MAP data to end of 22/23 FAST data. Proficiency in Science will increase by 10% (40% to 50%) as measured by the SSA.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	School based instructional leadership team (ILT) (Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coaches, Math Coach,MTSS Coach, and Magnet Instructional Staff Developer) will monitor data through the use of all common assessments, formative, and summative assessments. We will also monitor that interventions for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students are done with fidelity. The ILT will provide support and feedback focused on explicit, systematic and sequential approaches for all instructional content areas.
Person responsible for	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

monitoring outcome:	
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Collaboratively plan and teach standards-based lessons with an emphasis on task alignment to the standard(s) of the grade level, develop and apply foundational skills, as well as, teacher monitoring/tracking student evidence in order to take action throughout the lesson.
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 increase proficiency, a plan must be developed that ensures units of study are standards-based and all student tasks align to those standards. Throughout each lesson with the unit(s), teachers need to track the work of the scholars, in order to adjust instruction to meet their needs and accelerate 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.

The ILT and teachers will engage in a variety of professional development that is content-focused, instructionally relevant, and has an end goal of improving scholar outcomes. PD will include: coaching cycles, structured PLC's, collaborative planning, and just-in time training.
A. ILT will meet a minimum of twice weekly to discuss, monitor, adjust, and follow through with a written action plan (from SBLT).
B. ILT and grade levels (to include ESE teachers) will calendar and participate in scheduled collaborative planning sessions, in which entire units will be planned at a time.
C. PLC's will be conducted weekly and student data will be analyzed and an action plan will be developed based on the analysis. Follow-up/monitoring included and adjustments to lesson plans will be completed.
D. Just in time PD and coaching cycles will be scheduled and monitored based on instructional walk through tools.

Person Responsible   Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Scholars will take ownership of their learning through the use of data tracking and learning board matrices in each classroom.
A. A learning board matrix will include the standard, target, task, and evidence in each classroom, for each subject, each day. By using the matrix, scholars will be able to explain what they are learning, why they are learning it and how they know when they have achieved the learning.
B. A frequently updated data wall will be utilized in each classroom and scholars will be able to explain

what their data is, what their goals are based on the data, and what they will do to achieve their goal(s). This should include celebrations.

Person Responsible	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Teachers will increase student engagement by employing instructional practices that support students doing the work.
A. extensive opportunities to write (in a variety of formats)
B. opportunities to collaborate with peers and increase oral language
C. decrease "teacher talk"
D. provide explicit and actionable feedback and opportunity for scholars to adjust learning
E. opportunities for student choice
F. use of hands-on activities, gaming, and manipulatives

Person Responsible	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
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.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy 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.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. 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.**	Upon review of the 21/22 data, the following proficiency data showed there is a critical need for SWD: 5th grade: 27% Reading, 18% Math, 36% Science (FSA/SSA) 4th grade: 8% Reading, 15% Math (FSA) 3rd grade: 8% Reading, 31% Math (FSA) 2nd grade: 20% Reading, 40% Math (MAP) 1st grade: 9% Reading, 27% Math (MAP) Kindergarten: 0% Reading (Running Record) and 0% (MAP)
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Proficiency in ELA and Math will increase by 10%, as measured by each grade level's assessment from the end of 21/22 FSA or MAP data to end of 22/23 FAST data. Proficiency in Science will increase by 10% (40% to 50%) as measured by the SSA.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	School based instructional leadership team (ILT) (Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coaches, Math Coach, MTSS Coach, and Magnet Instructional Staff Developer) will monitor data through the use of all common assessments, formative, and summative assessments. We will also monitor that interventions for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students are done with fidelity. The ILT will provide support and feedback focused on explicit, systematic and sequential approaches for all instructional content areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	ESE teachers will collaboratively plan with the grade level they support and provide specially designed supports for use in the core.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	In order for students with disabilities to master grade level content, they may require specially designed content and instruction to meet their needs in the core. Collaboration between the general education teacher and the ESE teacher is critical for the needs of our students to be met.

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.

ESE teachers will attend the collaborative planning session with the grade level team. She will follow the same protocol and come prepared and ready to provide resources for the shared students. The team will discuss the foundational gaps of each of their shared students and ensure they are addressing the same gaps at the same time.

Person Responsible   Julie Brewster (brewsterju@pcsb.org)

ESE teachers will utilize a foundational skills diagnostic to develop an instructional prescription for each student with disability that is below proficiency level according to STAR/Cambrio. The prescription will be based on the levels of reading acquisition: Instruction on their "just-right" level will be done during the intervention block, but not necessarily by the ESE teacher.

Person Responsible   Julie Brewster (brewsterju@pcsb.org)

#4. 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.**	Upon review of the 21/22 data, the following proficiency data showed there is a critical need for SWD (below 41%): 5th grade: 30% Reading, 30% Science (FSA/SSA) 4th grade: 11% Reading, 31% Math (FSA) 3rd grade: 15% Reading, 38% Math (FSA) 2nd grade: 27% Reading, 16% Math (MAP) 1st grade: 27% Reading, 33% Math (MAP)
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Proficiency in ELA and Math will increase by 10%, as measured by each grade level's assessment from the end of 21/22 FSA/MAP data to end of 22/23 FAST data. Proficiency in Science will increase by 10% (40% to 50%) as measured by the SSA.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	School based instructional leadership team (ILT) (Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coaches, Math Coach, MTSS Coach, and Magnet Instructional Staff Developer) will monitor data through the use of all common assessments, formative, and summative assessments. We will also monitor that interventions for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students are done with fidelity. The ILT will provide support and feedback focused on explicit, systematic and sequential approaches for all instructional content areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Teachers and staff will provide a safe and equitable environment in which black and multiracial scholars build a growth mindset and increase perseverance to achieve academic, behavioral, and social/emotional success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	A growth mindset is necessary to not only achieve success, but to push through and eliminate achievement gaps. To build a growth mindset and increase perseverance, scholars must be in an environment in which they feel it is safe to fail and learn from it. They need to be provided a positive role model/adult that will support them in acknowledging their data, set goals, and follow through on an action plan.

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.

The social services team will develop a plan to build and initiate a growth mindset curriculum into each classroom. To continue the growth mindset, mentors/adults on campus will follow up in supporting black scholars with data chats, goal setting, action planning, and monitoring the plan on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible   Christine Santana (santanac@pcsb.org)

Staff will participate in equity training and applicable ways to engage all scholars in learning each day. Teachers will complete a survey with scholars to identify what they like and don't like in classrooms, preferred ways to learn, etc. and then embed this information into their daily lessons. ILT will research and support teachers in supporting scholar engagement through the 6 M's.

Person Responsible   Pamela Richardson (richardsonp@pcsb.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
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.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy 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.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Kindergarten
Fall (FLKRS) Winter (MAP) Spring (MAP) Spring (RR)
ALL 12/50 24% 29/56 52% 39/55 71% 27/58 47%

1st Grade (MAP)
Fall Winter Spring
ALL 23/61 38% 21/61 34% 19/61 31%

2nd grade (MAP)
Fall Winter Spring
ALL 10/50 20% 12/52 23% 14/51 27%

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

3rd grade:
Fall MAP Winter MAP Spring FSA
ALL 11/61 18% 11/65 17% 16/64 25%

4th grade:
Fall MAP Winter MAP Spring FSA
ALL 4/29 14% 4/28 14% 6/34 18%

5th grade:
Fall MAP Winter MAP Spring FSA
ALL 12/45 27% 14/49 29% 21/50 42%

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 rates will increase by 20% in Grades K - 2, as measured by running records and ELFAC from beginning to end of school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Proficiency in ELA will increase by 10%, as measured by each grade level's assessment from the end of 21/22 FSA or MAP data to end of 22/23 FAST data.

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.

School based instructional leadership team (ILT) (Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coaches, MTSS Coach, and Magnet Instructional Staff Developer) will monitor data through the use of all common assessments, formative, and summative assessments. We will also monitor that interventions for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students are done with fidelity.
The ILT will provide support and feedback focused on explicit, systematic and sequential approaches for all instructional content areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Austin, Kelly, austink@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?

Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, feedback, etc. Ensuring the teachers have a clear understanding of the science of reading, we will use a diagnostic on each student to determine what gaps need to be filled. Students will receive interventions to fill these gaps and will be progress monitored on the gaps biweekly. Fluid groups will be used so students can be moved into groups that support their need as they master the levels of reading acquisition. The Flamingo Literacy small group plan will be the way of delivering many of our small groups, with an emphasis on phonics/phonemic awareness together and a transfer to real text and writing.

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 practices described above have a proven track record when the adults using it are monitored for fidelity and coached as needed.

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
• Ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the K-2 B.E.S.T. ELA Standards	Austin, Kelly, austink@pcsb.org
• Increase teacher knowledge of the science of reading & evidence-based practices.	Austin, Kelly, austink@pcsb.org
• Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark in the early grades, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.	Austin, Kelly, austink@pcsb.org
• Engage in ongoing professional development on the implementation of the high-quality curricular materials, including norming walks for excellence, studying student responses, and robust & constructive feedback.	Austin, Kelly, austink@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.

Positive school culture and environment begins with the adults on the campus. Administrators and the ILT need to build a culture of teamwork and openness in which all adults feel comfortable to learn and grow. Strong and consistent communication, monitoring, and specific/actionable feedback is essential to this work. The ILT believes in the philosophy of people over paper. When staff and students are on campus, the ILT will spend 80% of their day with people ensuring the school's plan is being initiated and support where there are needs. Staff will have PD on the school wide processes/procedures, expectations, and PBIS plan during preschool. They will be provided with a comprehensive plan with lesson plans. PBIS process/ procedures will be taught and practiced with scholars starting on the first day of school.A learning walk tool will be utilized in the first week and feedback will be provided and then supported by the ILT, with the staff. Throughout the year, the staff will use data to ensure consistency and follow through with the school-wide plan. Positive recognition will be used through the use of a token economy. To continue a culture in which every scholar feels a sense of belonging, the School-wide House System will be continued to build and focus on community building, team work, relationships, and friendly competition.

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

Administrators - Initiation of PBIS plan and positive culture/environment
ILT - Monitor and support teachers with consistency of PBIS plan
Assistant Principal - House System
MTSS Coach - Recognition with token economy/rewards/recognition
Behavior Specialist - Tier 2 Interventions and documentation
Social Worker - Tier 3 Interventions (FBA) & Attendance tracking
Counselor - social/emotional and growth mindset instruction for small groups
Parents/families - support of the school/teacher in building lifelong learners
Partnership with outside resources (Suncoast, Family Navigator)- individual counseling for scholars/families in need