

Pinellas County Schools

# Mildred Helms Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Mildred Helms Elementary School

561 CLEARWATER LARGO RD S, Largo, FL 33770

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

### Demographics

**Principal: Shannon Brennan**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (50%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

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

## Mildred Helms Elementary School

561 CLEARWATER LARGO RD S, Largo, FL 33770

<http://www.mildred-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	51%

### School Grades History

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

Mildred Helms Elementary International Baccalaureate (IB) World School is committed to developing knowledgeable, inquiring, caring and internationally minded lifelong learners.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

100% Student Success - Each learner will achieve a year's worth of growth in a year.

### 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
Brennan, Shannon	Principal	Principal, Instructional Leader, IB Head of School
Deoliveira, Mary	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Instructional Leader, PBIS Coach
Ovalle, Michelle		Leads school in MTSS, supports SBLT and CST, Lead Mentor
Gomez-Nieto, Gabriel	Teacher, K-12	ELL Lead teacher
Phoenix, Lori	Teacher, ESE	Lead ESE teacher
Riser, Mary	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher, Grade 1
Lannon, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher - Grade 2
Yuncker, Jerrie	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher, Grade 3
Enlow, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	Lead Teacher Grade 4
Campogni, Francine	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher Grade 5
Carlson, Ana	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher Specialists, Restorative Practices Trainer
Ingram, Jennifer	School Counselor	School Counselor
Hubbard, Emily	Psychologist	Lead Student Services
Callahan, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher - Kindergarten
Kelly, Jennifer	Magnet Coordinator	Magner Coordinator - IB PYP Programme
Hauburger, Cheryl	Parent Engagement Liaison	Family & Community Liaison

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, Shannon Brennan



**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.*

1

**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.*

10

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

44

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

527

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

8

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

8

### 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	43	81	80	89	75	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	449
Attendance below 90 percent	2	29	27	22	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	10	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	29	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	20	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	3	2	6	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	1	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

**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	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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**

Friday 8/19/2022

**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	53	91	99	96	93	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509
Attendance below 90 percent	0	24	31	29	19	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	1	2	4	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	53	91	99	96	93	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509
Attendance below 90 percent	0	24	31	29	19	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

#### 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	1	2	4	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	49%	55%	56%				44%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%						43%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						32%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	60%	51%	50%				54%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						49%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						38%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	62%	59%				46%	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	54%	56%	-2%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	56%	-17%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2022					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	69%	62%	7%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	64%	-20%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	60%	-16%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%
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	6	43	46	29	45		10				
ELL	29	71		40	62						
BLK	39	53	40	44	63	55	29				
HSP	40	53		60	55		58				
MUL	35	64		59	40						
WHT	59	66	73	67	53	43	63				
FRL	37	57	62	49	52	48	42				
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	21	40	50	33	27		13				
ELL	29	40		38	27		24				
BLK	26	35		39	35		19				
HSP	43	26		50	26		29				
MUL	41			48							
WHT	62	61		65	52		52				
FRL	42	42	43	47	39	31	26				
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	32	31	29	45	36	13				
ELL	32	30	30	46	50		29				
BLK	28	44		39	38	45					
HSP	41	37	45	43	34	30	39				
MUL	43			71							
WHT	52	44	19	64	63	42	52				
FRL	37	39	37	45	47	45	37				

### ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	449
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
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	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	55
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	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	61
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	51
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?

Math proficiency is higher than ELA for all students. ELL students have higher proficiency rates than SWDs for our school. The achievement gap for SWD student is larger than our other targeted subgroups.

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

The greatest need for improvements lies within our rising third grade. As second graders, they the lowest of all grade levels in reading and math.

#### 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 factors were the loss of instruction in the last third of the year in kindergarten. Close to forth students remained in the virtual learning model for first grade. Second grade spent a large portion of instruction building foundational skills. Project 23 and Title I support will focus on this grade as well as more targeted instruction based on formative assessments.

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

The most improved groups of students were are third graders who will be our fourth graders. These students who were impacted by COVID in first grade showed significant gains within the past year.

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

Collaborative planning within the grade level as well as coteaching with the ELL cluster. Project 23 support as well as our third grade small group differentiated instruction with an extended learning initiative in reading that focused primarily with decoding and comprehension skills and strategies.

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

Key focus will be on implementation of BEST Standards within the IB Units of Inquiry. Continued support from district staff developers to increase connection and alignment of standards and units and with support for Best Practices in all content areas. Monitor student data and continue screening of student and gifted and talented programs.

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

Professional development will focus on BEST Standards aligned with inquiry, conceptual teaching/ learning and questioning. MTSS Coach will support teams and teachers to analyze student achievement results to determine trends, areas of strength and areas of improvement. IB Primary Years Programmer training will be completed will all new staff with the goal of 100% of staff trained.

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

Continued professional development on data analysis, standards based planning, and conceptual development through inquiry within the UB Units of Inquiry. Vertical articulation between grade levels across all content areas and with specialists teachers to increase alignment with the IB Programme of Inquiry.

**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, common assessments, observation data, etc.) collected from 2021-22 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science. Instructional practices specifically related to standards based instruction will focus on supporting teachers with researched based practices that follow the B.E.S.T. and NGSSS Standards with all contents areas and aligned to the IB Primary Years Programme.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

Proficiency in ELA will increase from 48% to 55% as measured by state and district assessments.  
Proficiency in Math will increase from 60% to 65% as measured by state and district assessments.  
Proficiency in Science will increase from 51% to 55% as measured by state and district assessments.

**Monitoring:**

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

Increased monitoring through class observations, curriculum planning documents and data based PLCs following assessment cycles in all content areas and across the IB Programme of Inquiry.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Gain a deep understanding of the BEST Standards/NGSS as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.  
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.**

Teachers must have a clear understanding of standards and conceptual learning in ELA, math and science to ensure students are engaged in rigorous, grade level instruction and practice. Professional development aligned to schoolwide data will support effectiveness of implementation of curriculum within the IB Primary Years Programme.

**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 design of the BEST Standards in order to understand what students are expected to master.
- \*Synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.
- \*Purposefully combine/stack standards and benchmarks to support learning so that a benchmark is

spotlighted and supporting benchmarks that enhance instruction are incorporated into lessons to meet the demands of the spotlighted benchmarks.

\*Ensure alignment of standards and lessons within the IB Units of Inquiry are cohesively connected.

\*Conduct professional development aligned to data from state and district assessments.

**Person Responsible** Shannon Brennan (brennans@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.

ESSA subgroups specifically related to African American/Black students and Students with Disabilities (SWD)  
Standards based data (FSA, common assessments, observation data, etc.) collected from 2021-22 school year showed African American/Black, and SWD students performing below grade level in ELA.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

ELA Proficiency of African American/Black and SWD students will increase by 10% as measured by state assessments.

**Monitoring:**

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

Monitored using formative and summative district/state and classroom assessment followed by score analysis to determine progress and instructional planning. SBLT Team and MTSS Coach will work alongside classroom and resource teachers to determine monitoring tools and plans for intervention. Data will be monitored for students who qualify for Gifted/Talented as well as additional enrichment and extended learning programs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Michelle Ovalle (ovallem@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidenced based principles.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Engaging curriculum and the use of an inquiry based approach in whole and small group will increase the engagement and achievement of African American/Black and SWD students. Identifying and including highly engaging strategies and resources for a diverse population of learners will increase the connection and understanding of academic concepts and content knowledge. Clustering of students with like need and service requirements within an inclusion setting will maximize time allocation for service delivery.

**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.

\*Monitor African American/Black and SWD student performance utilizing all data points to determine trend data, provide feedback to staff and establish action plans from students not meeting proficiency.

\*Implement universal screening of gifted identification in primary grades to expand the number of African American/Black students in the Gifted and Talented Program.

\*Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction, independence and intervention. Include specialized instruction for Students with Disabilities as well as extensions for students above benchmarks. These supports include access to grade level texts and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.

**Person Responsible** Shannon Brennan (brennans@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. Kindergarten students that are not on track for the level 3 or above on the statewide standardized ELA assessment is 69%.

First grade students that are not on track for the level 3 or above on the statewide ELA assessment is 64%.

Second grade students that are not on track for the level 3 or above on the statewide ELA assessment is 61%.

### Grades 3-5: 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.

Third Grade students that are not on track for the level 3 or above on the statewide standardized ELA assessment is 56%.

Fourth grade students that are not on track for the level 3 or above on the statewide ELA assessment is 46%.

Fifth grade students that are not on track for the level 3 or above on the statewide ELA assessment is 53%.

**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)**

Last year, 65% of students in grades K-2 scored within the red or orange bands on Spring Reading on Spring Reading MAP. Our goal is for 55% of students to be on track to pass the ELA FAST in the Spring.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Proficiency in ELA will increase 10% from 49% to 59%, as measured by the module assessments, district provided benchmark assessments, formative and summative 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.

THE ILT will conduct walkthroughs of the classrooms and provide timely feedback to teachers. Data chats will occur in a timely manner in order to make data driven decisions in the classrooms. Coaching cycles will occur based on teacher interest and for whom the data shows a need for improvement. Data chats will come from module assessments, district provided benchmark assessments, formative and summative assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**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 schoolwide, district and state assessments in a timely manner  
Data driven decision making, derived from data chats.

Lesson study protocol  
 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 students in K-5 who 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 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. Data analysis protocols will be implemented to analyze various assessments (iStation, ELFAC, and other progress monitoring assessments).	Brennan, Shannon, brennans@pcsb.org
Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark in the early grades, including targeted instruction and frequently monitoring progress to eliminate gaps.	Deoliveira, Mary, deoliveiram@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.**

- \*Continue to develop a positive and equitable environment that values and supports the diversity for all members of the learning community utilizing a schoolwide PBIS implementation plan.
- \*Develop a learning community that promotes a positive, safe environment in which people understand their roles and importance in developing relationships with students to support their academic and social emotional learning needs.
- \*Increase average daily attendance of students to at least 95% through increasing parent communication regarding the importance and the impact of attendance on academic progress.
- \*Increase Family and Community involvement in school sponsored events by 10% through increased marketing efforts and communication using iMHES morning news, school marquee, school newsletter, School Messenger, student agenda planners and Class Dojo.
- \*Implement a Title One schoolwide program that supports the engagement of all stakeholders through academic and behavioral supports, professional development and family involvement.

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

- \*SBLT will provide professional development and lesson plans for implementation of the schoolwide PBIS program.
- \*Parent and Community members will provide input through implementation and support of the school through daily interactions.
- \*Team will monitor student attendance and collaborate with Student Services Team and Family and Community Liaison to provide additional resources for families in need.
- \*Family and Community Involvement Liaison and Magnet Coordinator will provide support with marketing and communication for Family events as well as work with the Community to attain additional resources for the school.