

Pinellas County Schools

Seventy Fourth St. Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

| Table of Contents | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Seventy Fourth St. Elementary

3801 74TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33709

<http://www.74th-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Cristen Ku

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2022

| | |
|--|---|
| 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: D (37%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (41%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| ESSA Status | CSI |
| * 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Seventy Fourth St. Elementary

3801 74TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33709

<http://www.74th-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 | 57% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of 74th Street Elementary is to set high expectations and celebrate student success in our community of learners to create an environment of maximum student achievement.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Hathaway, Jessley | Principal | The role of the principal is to provide strategic direction in the school, support a standardized curriculum, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement data, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate the staff and oversee facilities. |
| Owens, Alexandra | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal - Member of the Instructional Leadership Team and support the mission/vision of 74th Street Elementary. |
| Bachnik, Jennifer | School Counselor | School Counselor / Bullying Investigator |
| Patterson, Anna | Behavior Specialist | ESE Chairperson |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/29/2022, Cristen Ku

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

490

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

7

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

5

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 | 38 | 75 | 82 | 72 | 63 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 394 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 37 | 39 | 24 | 22 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 |
| 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 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 50 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 40 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 |
| 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 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 69 | 85 | 70 | 68 | 70 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 433 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 22 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| 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 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 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 | 69 | 85 | 70 | 68 | 70 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 433 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 22 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| 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 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 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 | 29% | 55% | 56% | | | | 40% | 54% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 39% | | | | | | 55% | 59% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 34% | | | | | | 46% | 54% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 39% | 51% | 50% | | | | 43% | 61% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 49% | | | | | | 41% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 34% | | | | | | 32% | 48% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 35% | 62% | 59% | | | | 39% | 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 | 34% | 56% | -22% | 58% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 56% | -4% | 58% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -34% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 54% | -13% | 56% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |

| 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 | 37% | 62% | -25% | 62% | -25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 64% | -13% | 64% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -37% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 60% | -15% | 60% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 38% | 54% | -16% | 53% | -15% |
| 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 | 11 | 15 | 8 | 23 | 38 | 38 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 21 | 25 | | 38 | 50 | | 17 | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 45 | 50 | 22 | 38 | 20 | 33 | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 46 | | 43 | 63 | | 33 | | | | |
| MUL | 27 | | | 36 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 26 | 35 | 30 | 49 | 49 | 40 | 32 | | | | |
| FRL | 26 | 41 | 38 | 38 | 46 | 30 | 34 | | | | |
| 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 | 11 | 28 | | 22 | 17 | | 10 | | | | |
| ELL | 22 | | | 33 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 58 | | | 67 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 18 | | | 18 | | | 25 | | | | |
| HSP | 27 | 47 | | 33 | 18 | | 40 | | | | |
| WHT | 22 | 19 | | 32 | 38 | | 30 | | | | |
| FRL | 25 | 37 | | 29 | 23 | 20 | 32 | | | | |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 14 | 37 | 50 | 25 | 30 | 27 | | | | | |
| ELL | 26 | 44 | | 43 | 36 | | 21 | | | | |
| ASN | 60 | 70 | | 67 | 60 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 52 | 40 | 32 | 28 | | 23 | | | | |
| HSP | 35 | 56 | 50 | 41 | 38 | | 30 | | | | |
| MUL | 67 | 50 | | 57 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 41 | 55 | 53 | 42 | 43 | 37 | 43 | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 56 | 55 | 39 | 37 | 36 | 38 | | | | |

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) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 40 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 57 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 316 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 22 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 3 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 35 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 33 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 47 |
| 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 | 32 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 37 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 39 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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?

When looking at our Winter (Dec) Map data our school was indicating that 30% of our 3, 4, 5 grade scholars were proficient in ELA.

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

Based on the 2022 state assessment data components show the most need for improvement.

1. ELA proficiency 29% and Math proficiency 39%
2. White, Black, Multiracial, SWD, ED, ELL on the ESSA index.

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

Contributing factors for the lack of students meeting grade level expectations in the area of math are due to limited opportunities for students to interact with rigorous grade level aligned tasks. Inexperienced teacher knowledge of the standards and the use of standards aligned resources are also a contributing factor. Moving forward, teachers will participate in collaborative planning with instructional coaches to review grade level standards, mathematical practices and real world applications that are directly related to item specifications. Teachers will also receive professional development and specific observation feedback about their practice in regards to student engagement and opportunities for all.

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

The areas that showed the most improvement from the 2022 FSA were in the Areas of:

1. Math proficiency
2. Math Learning Gains
3. Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%
4. ELA Learning Gains
5. Science Proficiency

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

We believe the following were contributing factors: collaborative planning, reflection and action based on student evidence, explicit foundational instruction, more explicit intervention instruction for students severely deficient in reading and math. During the 21-22 school year, teachers collaborating with coaching support was one of the contributing facts for success in that content area. Teachers would meet weekly with on-site coaches to discuss standards and questioning strategies. Teachers would work through misconceptions and prepare lessons for discussion to demonstrate a scholars understanding of the standard and its' complexity. Teachers then had the chance to review student data to see how instructional decisions correlated with student achievement.

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

In order to accelerate learning, teachers at 74th Street Elementary will incorporate high yield teaching strategies as well as explicit instruction. Students will be given multiple opportunities to work with grade level text

and rigorous tasks that challenge their understanding and mastery of standards. Specific programs like Accelerate Reader, iStation, Study Island and others will be monitored to ensure fidelity within the program.

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.

At 74th Street Elementary teachers will participate in afternoon collaborative planning sessions lead by coaches and administrators to deepen the understanding of the standards and tasks by teachers. Appropriate grade level text will be reviewed and question stems and practice opportunities will be shared to increase the number of students who are then able to master that standard. Professional development will also take place with the BEST standards, SEL curriculum to encourage a safe and positive learning environment and use of the computer program iStation and Dreambox to monitor students diagnostic and mid-year growth.

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

To sustain student achievement at 74th Street Elementary teacher effectiveness will continue to be our area of focus. We will continue to lead with an instructional lens on raising student achievement As the instructional leaders, administrators and coaches will continue to facilitate teachers learning in collaborative planning. During this planning time, teachers will enhance their understanding of the standards and cognitive complexities, plan and implement high yield strategies that promote student discussion and engagement and reflect on student achievement through formative and summative data points. Differentiation of instruction will be an area of growth for teachers as we continue to promote mastery of standards at each grade level Administration will observe teaching and provide feedback on instructional practices and student outcomes during real time teaching and planning sessions. Teachers will also gain feedback through coaching sessions and collaborative planning after school hours.

Program use will be reviewed consistently and teachers and staff will have the chance to review student progress with instructional leaders and their students.

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, ISM data, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students were performing below grade level in ELA, Math and Science. This shows a need for more consistency with standards-based task/target alignment as well as more opportunities for students to be successful with standards-aligned tasks. In order to do this, teachers will have more reliable methods to support our students' achievement as measured by the BEST standards.

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

Proficiency in Science will increase 15% (from 35% to 50%) as measured by SSA.
 Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 25% (from 29% to 54%) as measured by FAST.
 Proficiency in Mathematics will increase 20% (from 39% to 59%) as measured by FAST.

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

The area of focus will be monitored by end of module assessments, ISIP, checks for understanding, MAP and walk-through feedback from the instructional leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christen Ku (kuc@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented

Teachers will collaboratively plan standards-based lessons with the end in mind as it directly relates to student task. The student tasks must get to the end result which allows the student to master the standard. The teacher will focus on task alignment, develop foundational skills and monitor student evidence in order to take action if needed.

**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.**

Gain a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T Standards/NGSSS as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes. Synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards. Prior to teaching any lesson, instructional staff will plan with the end in mind and focus on the student task. This will be done through collaborative planning sessions with coaches and teachers (Gen Ed/ESE/ELL). After planning the lessons and discussing possible misconceptions, teachers must observe and monitor student work to and make instructional decisions based on student evidence. Student misconceptions can then be corrected with a whole class or small group reteach.

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.

Purposefully combine/stack standards and benchmarks to support learning so that a benchmark is spotlighted and supporting benchmarks that enhance instruction are incorporated in the lesson to meet the demands of the spotlighted benchmark.

**Person
Responsible** Christen Ku (kuc@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.

In the 2022- 2023 school year we will have high expectations for all of our students including our six subgroups; Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners, White, Black and Multiracial. Our subgroup proficiency scores have shown minimal to no gains for three years. Learning gains and L25 learning gains have also been minimal. We believe there is a foundational literacy gap with a high percentage of our students. It is our firm belief that providing high expectations for our scholars with standards aligned rigorous instruction, it will lead to a much improved overall school score.

Measurable**Outcome:**

State the specific measurable

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

The percentage of students reaching ELA proficiency will increase to 54% in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades.

The percentage of students making learning gains will increase to 65%.

The percentage of L25 students making learning gains will increase to 70%

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored by end of module assessments, ISIP, checks for understanding, looking at MAP and walk-through feedback from the instructional leadership team.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

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

We are clustering students based on language proficiency, instructional needs and data to provide an inclusive, core environment for all students. In addition, all students will have access to the on grade level text. They will be required to perform the same tasks with necessary supports. Data for each student will be examined to determine foundational gaps and instruction will occur during intervention block and core instructional time to close learning gaps.

Additional learning opportunities are provided outside of the school day to broaden background knowledge, schema, vocabulary and experiences.

Rationale for

Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific

All students will learn the BEST standards and have a better chance of mastering grade level standards. All teachers will plan collaboratively with instructional coaches and prepare to teach collaboratively in order to provide specialized instruction that is aligned to grade level standards. Foundational gaps will be addressed during the intervention block in small groups.

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.

ILT will monitor lesson planning and implementation of effective lessons to engage all scholars in rigorous, standards-based work. Utilize the Marzano Focus Model to provide ongoing feedback.

Person Responsible Christen Ku (kuc@pcsb.org)

ELL teachers will plan collaboratively to front load content, vocabulary and context to scaffold up to the rigor of the standard for our ELL and Hispanic subgroups. During collaborative planning ELL teachers will ensure classroom teachers have identified each LY student and their proficiency level. ELL teachers and coaches will provide support using the MPI's embedded within the modules. Just in time coaching will be requested from the ELL department as needed.

Person Responsible Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

ESE teachers will plan collaboratively to front load content, vocabulary and context to scaffold up to the rigor of the standard for our SWD subgroup. During collaborative planning ESE teachers will ensure classroom teachers have identified each ESE student and the supports outlined in their IEP.

Person Responsible Alexandra Owens (owensal@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

K - 2 teachers are participating in the PELI grant through the work of the Lastinger Center at the University of Florida. A cite based primary reading coach and administration will strategically support the equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching and feedback.

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

A cite based ELA coach and administration will strategically support teachers in grades 3 - 5 through the equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching and feedback.

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)

Our 2022 MAP scores grades K - 2 indicate that 29% of our scholars are proficient in ELA. Our goal for the 2023 school year is for our ELA scores to improve to 51% proficiency as measured by the FAST, ISIP, formative assessments, running records.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our scores on the 2022 FSA indicate that 29% of our 3rd - 5th grade scholars are proficient in ELA. Our goal for the 2023 school year is for our ELA scores to improve to 51% proficiency as measured by the ISIP, formative assessments, running records.

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.

During the school year, our Leadership Literacy team will review our ELA data monthly to ensure we are tracking progress of our scholars towards our grade level goals. We will also monitor our teachers participation in PLC's and PD by sign in sheets and classroom walkthrough/feedback provided by both administration and our ELA coach.

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?

For the 2022-2023 school year, our K-2 classrooms will implement a small group instruction model that will be taught through our work in the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative and in partnership with the Lastinger Center at UF. This model will focus on specific teacher practice within an instructional framework to promote strong literacy skills.

For the 2022-2023 school year, our 3rd grade classrooms will focus on specific small group instructional practices that align with the B.E.S.T. standards and the science of reading. An instructional routine as well as reciprocal teaching will be in place to promote comprehension skills and fluency practice. Programs that will be implemented will include Project 23, LLI and IRLA.

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?

In the 2021-2022 school year, other elementary schools within the district saw positive achievement for their K-2 scholars using the small group instructional framework delivered through the PELI project. At GMES, we also used the UFLI model with our targeted population of retained 3rd graders and saw 70% growth within the reading assessment data.

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 |
|---|--|
| Collaboratively planning with literacy coach will take place on a weekly basis. Teachers will be responsible for unpacking their materials prior to attending planning in order to ensure the heavy lift is focused on aligned instruction and task to the rigor of the standard. | Ku, Christen, kuc@pcsb.org |
| Professional Development and additional collaborative planning time with coach support will be provided in addition to the weekly collaborative planning. Coaches and administration will be present to provide actionable feedback and support. | Ku, Christen, kuc@pcsb.org |
| ILT will conduct walkthroughs and provide actionable feedback to ensure the fidelity of the collaborative work and alignment to standards. | Ku, Christen, kuc@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.

This year at Seventy-Fourth Street Elementary, we will continue to implement PBIS with a strong focus on positive classroom interactions between teacher and scholar. The PBIS team will meet monthly to ensure expectations for everyone on campus are clear and visible. We will implement Harmony which will explicitly teach all scholars about being a part of a community and the role that one plays when interacting with peers and others.

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

Everyone within the Seventy-Fourth Elementary family has a role to play in creating and sustaining a positive school campus. Scholars will be expected to arrive at school ready to learn and seek opportunities to continue to grow and achieve in and out of the classroom setting. Teachers will be expected to teach and remind students of school wide expectations. Teachers can also be a part of the PBIS team and help promote positivity among the campus.

The behavior specialists will spend time mentoring and coaching newer staff on school wide expectations and assisting with our implementation of Harmony, a campus wide social-emotional curriculum creates a community within the classroom and among the school campus. Teachers and support staff will be encouraged to promote positivity and specific praise to those scholars who are demonstrating a successful understanding of what it looks like to be a member of the Seventy-Fourth Family. Administration will be present in classrooms and throughout the campus to reinforce school wide expectations as well.

Family engagement will be encouraged at nightly and school wide events like Open House, ELA, Math and Science nights and other events like family picnics, parent conferences and book fairs. The administration will reach out to the community and business partners to support the school endeavors that recognize positive academic and behavior improvements at the Jaguar Jams, for example supporting honor roll ceremonies, character award events and attendance awards to recognize students who are attending school daily.