

Pinellas County Schools

Melrose Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Melrose Elementary School

1752 13TH AVE S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

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

Demographics

Principal: Melanie Hill Anderson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2022

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* Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (42%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Melrose Elementary School

1752 13TH AVE S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

<http://www.melrose-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	96%

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.

The mission at Melrose Center for Journalism and Multimedia is to educate and prepare each scholar for college, and career readiness, in order to:

- increase the academic performance of underserved scholars
- develop effective educators
- share successful practices with other forward-thinking educators
- catalyze change in Melrose.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Melrose Elementary School is to become a progressive educational institute fostering high levels of achievement for all scholars.

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
Hill-Anderson, Melanie	Principal	<p>Melanie Hill-Anderson, Principal Jennifer Smith, Asst. Principal Jeanette Peterson, Literacy Coach Tiffany Gist, Math Coach Jennifer Bowens, Science Coach Nicole Nelson, MTSS Coach Jasmyne Gambrah, Guidance Counselor Steven Kornell, Social Worker Dr. Casie Peet, Psychologists Rebecca Sutton, Speech/Language Therapist Emily Marston, ESE Lead Teacher Transformation Zone Team under the leadership of Chief Transformation Officer, Donnika Jones</p>
	Assistant Principal	<p>The Principal and Assistant Principal provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensuring uninterrupted Core Instructional takes place daily in ALL classrooms. The implementation of Power Hour/Intervention is implemented with fidelity and integrity daily. The principal and assistant principal will provide ongoing professional development for all faculty and staff based on our school-wide data: academic, behavior, attendance, teachers' observations, parents, community, students, and faculty and staff surveys. The principal and assistant will ensure parents receive ongoing progress of their child's academic and non-academic progress as well as ensure we have monthly parents' workshop that aligned with our academic program of work.</p>
	Literacy, Math and Science Coach	<p>Literacy, Math and Science Coach will provide teachers resources and support in a non-evaluative way. Most of the coaches' time will be spent implementing feedback based on the Marzano iObservation practices with teachers, through coaching cycles, meeting teachers where they are to differentiate their support. As the coaches will provide support in the five areas of instructional support for teachers: theory underlying instruction, demonstration of activities, observation of teachers practicing new lessons, feedback and reflection about instruction, and supporting collaboration among teachers weekly in our grade level professional learning communities. They will facilitate frequent professional development meetings devoted to examining samples of student work and assessment data, helping teachers interpret assessment information and use that information to provide more focused instruction based on student needs. Additionally, the coaches will lead Literacy, Math, and Science workshops with parents.</p>
	MTSS Coach	<p>The MTSS Coach will work closely with our school Educational Diagnostician with our Tier II and III scholars. They will collaborate with the Literacy and Math Coaches about Tier II and III scholar progress. The MTSS Coach and Educational Diagnostician will have a laser-like focus on Tier II and III scholars. Tier II scholars will receive an additional 30 minutes daily of small group instruction. (Progress monitoring bi-weekly) Tier III will receive 60 minutes of small group instruction. (Progress monitoring weekly) The MTSS Coach will inform the coaches on how to support the teachers during core instruction and on how to differentiate instruction. MTSS coach will provide adequate</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>professional development as needed on implementing RTI with fidelity and integrity. Additionally, she will work with small groups.</p> <p>Professional School Guidance Counselor: Participates in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of school-wide data; provides support for intervention fidelity participates in the planning and provision of social-emotional interventions for classroom and small group. Provides weekly guidance sessions by grade level in the areas of academic achievement, personal/social development and career development, ensuring today's students become the productive, well-adjusted adults of tomorrow. Counselor ensures all 504 plans are followed with fidelity. She will provide teachers with professional development on 504 plans and referrals. The school counselor works directly with the scholar service team and helps to support the MTSS process related to academics and behavior.</p> <p>School Psychologist: Participates in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates the development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based making activities. The School Psychologist will support ESE program ongoing. The psychologist may also facilitate small group and 1 on 1 interventions as needed.</p> <p>School Social Worker: Provides services ranging from program design to assessment and intervention facilitates the development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based making activities with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social worker continues to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. The School Social Worker will support the ESE program ongoing. The social worker may also facilitate small group and 1 on 1 interventions as needed.</p> <p>Speech-Language will work across grade level to provide appropriate speech-language services. She will offer services addressing the linguistic and metalinguistic foundations of curriculum learning for students with disabilities, as well as other learners who are at risk for school failure, or those who struggle in school settings.</p> <p>Transformation Zone Team will provide ongoing academic and non-academic support to ensure that students are prepared and poised for 100 percent success during their education journey. Melrose is in the Transformation Zone. Within the Transformation Zone, the team will support educators at all levels work collaboratively to build strong schools that enables all students to achieve at or above grade level.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/25/2022, Melanie Hill Anderson

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

345

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

5

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

4

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	60	61	60	61	45	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	345
Attendance below 90 percent	33	28	33	37	31	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	9	27	25	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	18	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	41	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	0	0	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	82	61	72	76	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	412
Attendance below 90 percent	36	46	32	39	41	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
One or more suspensions	1	2	6	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	33	26	32	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
Course failure in Math	0	33	26	32	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	2	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	82	61	72	76	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	412
Attendance below 90 percent	36	46	32	39	41	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
One or more suspensions	1	2	6	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	33	26	32	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
Course failure in Math	0	33	26	32	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	2	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	27%	55%	56%				27%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						58%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%						70%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	44%	51%	50%				38%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	75%						54%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	88%						48%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	27%	62%	59%				36%	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	20%	56%	-36%	58%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	28%	56%	-28%	58%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
05	2022					
	2019	32%	54%	-22%	56%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

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	45%	62%	-17%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	64%	-31%	64%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	39%	60%	-21%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	53%	-19%
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	13	37		24	61						
BLK	25	53	64	40	72	86	23				
HSP	45	70		70							
FRL	28	54	68	44	76	86	29				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	11	59		22	76		9				
BLK	23	59	92	36	56	75	26				
HSP	38			54							
FRL	26	57	83	39	61	83	29				
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	7	45	60	11	33	50					
BLK	25	55	64	38	54	46	31				
HSP	30			50							
FRL	27	60	72	38	53	50	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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	384
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
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	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
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?

Reading proficiency continues to lag year over year in ELA and hasn't moved past 27% proficiency. Scholars most greatly impacted are Scholars with Disabilities.

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

All aspects of the 5 major components of reading to include fluency, phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary and comprehension. Our scholars lack the skills of decoding and encoding and the ability to access the academic vocabulary to make meaning of complex text.

FSA Data: Grade 3 and 5th ELA achievement showed the greatest deficit with a decline year over year.

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

Lagging K-2 foundational skills had not been mastered before scholars reached grades 3-5. Specific interventions will be administered daily with progress monitoring and fidelity checks to ensure that scholars in both K-2 gained the skills needed to become successful readers and in grades 3-5 are taught the skills needed through intervention.

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

Based on the 2022 FSA, math achievement increased 6% from 38% to 44%, math learning gains increased 16% from 59% to 75%, and math L 25 increased 11% from 77% to 88%.

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

Writing was taught, analyzed, action planned for and reassessed on a cycle. Scholars tracked their data and worked in small groups to improve targeted individual focus areas of refinement.

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

Training teachers on various tools for intervention. Continue the consistent utilization of data to plan for differentiation, intervention, and scaffold instruction to increase student achievement

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.

See Professional Development Plan

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

Ongoing Professional Development/Refresher of research based interventions (JRGR,LLI, and PELI). Ongoing feedback provided to teachers on their use of differentiated instruction practices/interventions, and high-yield standards based instructional strategies. Ongoing K-5 Literacy and Mathematics aligned to BEST standards. K-5 Reading and Math Interventionists. Embedded literacy/math/science coaching.

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, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science. Overall learning gains and learning gains for the L 25% were a primary focus and had significant increases. While there was some evidence of closing the achievement gap, proficiency in ELA, mathematics and science continues to be a need.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 19% (from 27% to 46%), as measured by FAST ELA Assessment.
 Proficiency in Mathematics will increase 11% (from 44% to 55%), as measured by FAST Mathematics Assessment
 Proficiency in Science will increase 14% (from 27% to 41%), as measured by State Science Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

iReady Diagnostic Assessments (Reading/Math)
 FAST Diagnostic Assessments- ELA/Math (beginning of the year and midyear comparisons)
 Monthly district/school assessments in ELA, mathematics and science
 Monthly iStation Assessments (ELA)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Hill-Anderson (hill-andersonm@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 evidence-based principles.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

According to John Hattie's work on visible learning and effect size show that direct instruction is 0.60 and classroom discussion is 0.82.

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.

Utilize administrator walkthrough tools to provide weekly feedback to individual teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff.

Person Responsible Melanie Hill-Anderson (hill-andersonm@pcsb.org)

Employ instructional practices that result in students doing the work of the lesson (higher-order questioning, quick demonstration followed by practice, limiting teacher talk, high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback).

Person Responsible Melanie Hill-Anderson (hill-andersonm@pcsb.org)

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.

Person Responsible Melanie Hill-Anderson (hill-andersonm@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

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

According to the 2022 MAP Assessment, students in grade K - 63% were average or above expectations; 1st grade - 27% average or above expectations; 2nd grade - 27% average or above expectations. Our instructional practice this year will be to focus on standards aligned instruction. Since we have new standards/benchmarks B.E.S.T., we will utilize time in our ELA collaborative hubs to ensure grade level benchmark, target, task and evidence of learning are all present and aligned.

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

Proficiency data for 2022 FSA ELA was 27% for grades 3-5. Our instructional practice this year will be to focus on standards aligned instruction. Since we have new standards/benchmarks B.E.S.T., we will utilize time in our ELA collaborative hubs to ensure grade level benchmark, target, task and evidence of learning are all present and aligned.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Proficiency in English Language Arts will maintain or increase Kindergarten from 68% on grade level and will increase in grades 1 and 2 from 27% to 46% of students on grade level as measured on the STAR ELA Assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 19% (from 27% to 46%), as measured by FAST ELA Assessment.

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.

iReady Diagnostic ELA Assessments
 Monthly district/school assessments
 Weekly Performance Tasks with Rubric
 iStation monthly assessment

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hill-Anderson, Melanie, hill-andersonm@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?

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

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?

Teachers have had summer training, pre-school training and ongoing professional development during collaborative planning regarding the new benchmarks and are now putting into practice what they have learned.

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
Become familiar with the vertical progression and standards design in order to understand what students are expected to master.	Hill-Anderson, Melanie, hill-andersonm@pcsb.org
Synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.	Hill-Anderson, Melanie, hill-andersonm@pcsb.org
Purposefully combine/stack standards and benchmarks to support learning so that a benchmark is spotlighted and supporting benchmarks (such as ELA Expectations) that enhance instruction are incorporated in the lesson to meet the demands of the spotlighted benchmark.	Hill-Anderson, Melanie, hill-andersonm@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.

By focusing on PBIS, teachers create an environment that helps all students achieve important behavior for a successful learning environment. PBIS is a multi-tiered framework to teach positive social and cognitive behaviors, PBIS provides strategies for students to engage in the classroom by setting behavioral expectations, positive rewards, and clear consequences. These practices are supported by the physical school environment, effective classroom routines, and behavioral expectations. Additionally using Restorative practices provides our scholars opportunities to focus on resolving conflict, repairing harm, and healing relationships. RPs support a positive and safe school climate, prevent bullying, and reduce disciplinary incidents. Maintaining a restorative culture mitigates the negative effects of punitive discipline policies that can exacerbate inequity. Furthermore, our teachers will be introduced to AVID this

school year. AVID provides scaffolded support that educators and scholars need to encourage college and career readiness and success. This increases scholar engagement and ownership of their learning.

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

The PBIS team consists of the assistant principal, guidance counselor, school psychologist, MTSS coach, social worker, behavior specialist and classroom teachers.

The PBIS team delivers staff training on PBIS school wide expectations with all staff and provide walkthrough feedback to teachers. The PBIS team teaches scholar expectations to scholars during PBIS and AVID assemblies for all grade levels.

Tier 1 behavior expectations posters are posted in common areas and maintained by administration.

Common area rules are visible in high need common areas and are maintained by admin and utilized by teachers and scholars.

The PBIS Rewards tier 1 behavior collection data tool is monitored by administration and the behavior specialist.

Teachers use specific praise to acknowledge adherence to rules using the ration 3 to 1. The PBIS team monitors using a feedback form.

Classroom rewards are provided by both teachers and the PBIS team based on scholar input.

The AVID team consists of classroom teachers and the assistant principal. Monthly trainings with grade level teams ensure the delivery of tools and strategies to promote college and career readiness.