Madeira Beach Fundamental K 8 School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Madeira Beach Fundamental K 8

591 TOM STUART CAUSEWAY, Made IR A Beach, FL 33708

http://www.mb-ms.pinellas.k12.fl.us/

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Madeira Beach Fundamental will provide a rigorous student-centered learning environment to ensure 100% student success by working collaboratively with all faculty, staff, and community stakeholders, by preparing students for college and career readiness in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ateek, Christopher	Principal	
Altenore, Carolyn	Assistant Principal	
Crandall, Brooke	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team includes our administration as well as the guidance department, student services members including the school social worker and school psychologist, team leaders for each elementary grade level, and department chair for each middle school department. The administrative leadership team meets weekly, and the full school leadership team meets biweekly. Other stakeholders, including students and parents participate in the School Advisory Committee and provide input on the SIP development process.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored regularly in school leadership meetings and in PLCs held by grade level and/or departments. The PLCs will include data chats and strategy discussions to ensure that action steps are implemented with fidelity and to assess the impact of the strategies on meeting the goals of the SIP. A mid-year review of the SIP will track our progress and provide opportunity for revision of action steps if necessary.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	27%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	6	7	10	4	15	11	31	51	64	199
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	0	4	4	23	34
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	11	4	35	29	51	133
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	9	1	17	31	29	91
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	4	0	16	25	27	73

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	8	11	12	19	12	58	66	81	275
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	1	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	9	2	18	36	27	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	8	3	20	28	17	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	2	29	26	30	88

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	8	11	12	19	12	58	66	81	275
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	1	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	9	2	18	36	27	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	8	3	20	28	17	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	2	29	26	30	88

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	69	55	53	70	55	55	72		
ELA Learning Gains				57			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			44		
Math Achievement*	86	61	55	81	34	42	78		
Math Learning Gains				68			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			47		
Science Achievement*	78	52	52	73	57	54	72		
Social Studies Achievement*	92	69	68	89	57	59	89		
Middle School Acceleration	83	69	70	80	44	51	84		
Graduation Rate		44	74		49	50			
College and Career Acceleration		17	53		65	70			
ELP Progress		56	55		69	70			

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	81
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	487
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	621
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	50			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	47			
HSP	83			
MUL	90			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	67			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	52			
HSP	73			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	58			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	69			86			78	92	83			
SWD	27			57			41	60	67		5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	77			92			88	93	100		5	
BLK	39			61			40				3	
HSP	76			85			76	93	86		5	
MUL	76			87			85	100	100		5	
PAC												
WHT	68			87			79	92	80		6	
FRL	53			77			56	83	64		6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	70	57	44	81	68	59	73	89	80			
SWD	31	43	38	46	46	41	35	54				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	73	55		92	82		85	86	85			

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	45	54	47	45	57	63					
HSP	71	65	48	81	69	67	73	96	86		
MUL	55	49	21	72	64	50	57	75	82		
PAC											
WHT	71	56	44	82	68	59	73	90	79		
FRL	53	49	45	63	57	49	61	75	69		

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	72	59	44	78	58	47	72	89	84		
SWD	37	35	28	44	34	24	28	81	42		
ELL	79	64		79	50						
AMI											
ASN	85	69		93	71		80	100	96		
BLK	47	50	17	59	43	21	50				
HSP	76	64	50	78	65	56	85	83	84		
MUL	66	56	27	71	41	27	67		83		
PAC											
WHT	72	58	45	79	58	48	71	89	83		
FRL	60	51	36	63	50	43	56	86	71		

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	81%	57%	24%	54%	27%
07	2023 - Spring	68%	48%	20%	47%	21%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	63%	47%	16%	47%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	58%	15%	58%	15%
06	2023 - Spring	67%	47%	20%	47%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	78%	53%	25%	50%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	90%	58%	32%	54%	36%
07	2023 - Spring	55%	36%	19%	48%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	85%	62%	23%	59%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	66%	15%	61%	20%
08	2023 - Spring	90%	61%	29%	55%	35%
05	2023 - Spring	91%	61%	30%	55%	36%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	76%	47%	29%	44%	32%
05	2023 - Spring	83%	60%	23%	51%	32%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	53%	41%	50%	44%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	46%	54%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	68%	25%	66%	27%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component showing the lowest performance is English Language Arts. In general, at a proficiency level of 69%, English Language Arts (ELA) scores were lower than scores for other instructional areas (Mathematics, Science, Social Studies). There were several changes introduced in the 2022-2023 school year for English Language Arts, including a move to computer-based testing for all grade levels, a move to F.A.S.T. testing during three progress monitoring windows, and a move to the B.E.S.T. benchmarks for ELA. In addition, reading as an elective course was removed as a required course for all 6th graders starting last year. This lack of reading instruction may have contributed to lower overall proficiency in ELA.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The only data component that declined from the prior year was English Language Arts. In 2021-2022, the proficiency level was 70%, while in 2022-2023, the proficiency level dropped to 69%. There were several changes introduced in the 2022-2023 school year for English Language Arts, including a move to computer-based testing for all grade levels, a move to F.A.S.T. testing during three progress monitoring windows, and a move to the B.E.S.T. benchmarks for ELA. In addition, reading as an elective course was removed as a required course for all 6th graders.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

All data components were above the state average. The state average for ELA is 50%, while our proficiency is 69%. The state average for Mathematics is 56% proficient on the F.AS.T./B.E.S.T. , 86% proficient on Algebra I, and 94% on Geometry. Our proficiency is 88% overall for all mathematics areas, with 94% proficiency on Algebra I and 100% proficiency on Geometry. The state average for the Statewide Science Assessment is 51% at the 5th grade level and 47% at the 8th grade level, while our proficiency is 83% at the 5th grade level and 76% at the 8th grade level. The state average for Civics is 66%, while our proficiency is 92%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component that showed the most improvement was our overall proficiency in mathematics. In 2021-2022, our overall proficiency in mathematics was 81%. In 2022-2023, the overall proficiency for all mathematics areas increased by 7% to 88% proficient. The factors that contributed to this improvement was collaborative planning among mathematics teachers, the use of staff developers to pinpoint our needs so that best practices could be put into place during all mathematics instruction. Finally, the B.E.S.T. benchmarks helps teachers understand what students need to know and be able to focus their planning and instruction on the specific requirements of the benchmarks.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The biggest potential area of concern based on EWS data is the number of students who miss 10% or more days. When students are not present, they are not learning, and this reflects in their performance across all subject areas.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Reading and writing across all content areas
2. Collaborative planning
3. Monitoring with constructive, immediate feedback

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

By focusing on monitoring whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles, we will improve the proficiency of all students in Mathematics. Teachers will focus on implementing evidence-based strategies to meet the needs of each student in order to improve student learning and increase the overall level of proficiency in Mathematics according to the B.E.S.T. standards across all grade levels.

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

The percent of all students achieving Mathematics proficiency will increase from 88% to 93%, as measured by the 2023-2024 F.A.S.T. Mathematics Achievement. E.O.C. Algebra will increase from 94% to 99% and E.O.C. Geometry Achievement will remain at 100% as reported on the School Grade Report.

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

Classroom observations, teacher/administrator conversations, utilizing progress monitoring assessments and tools, and teacher collaboration in common planning/PLCs.
STAR (K-2)
Cycle Assessment Data (Grades 6-8)
F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring Data (Grades 3-8)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention: Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Facilitate meaningful discourse
Pose purposeful questions
Build procedural fluency from conceptual understanding
Support productive struggle in learning mathematics
Elicit and use evidence of student thinking

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Facilitate meaningful mathematical discourse. - Effective teaching of mathematics facilitates discourse among students to build shared understanding of mathematical ideas by analyzing and comparing student approaches and arguments.
Pose purposeful questions. Effective teaching of mathematics uses purposeful questions to assess and advance students' reasoning and sense making about important mathematical ideas and relationships.
Build procedural fluency from conceptual understanding. Effective teaching of mathematics builds fluency with procedures on a foundation of conceptual understanding so that students, over time, become skillful in using procedures flexibly as they solve contextual and mathematical problems.
Support productive struggle in learning mathematics. Effective teaching of mathematics consistently provides students, individually and collectively, with opportunities and supports to engage in productive struggle as they grapple with mathematical ideas and relationships.
Elicit and use evidence of student thinking. Effective teaching of mathematics uses evidence of student

thinking to assess progress toward mathematical understanding and to adjust instruction continually in ways that support and extend learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers provide students with at least one differentiated opportunity within each unit of instruction that addresses either; 1) students mathematical readiness 2) students interest as it relates to the math, they are learning 3) students choice how to learn the material.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going

Align instruction to achievement level descriptors in levels (3-5) to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards and rigorous performance tasks aligned to BEST benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going

Within PLC/ and or common planning, teachers utilize student data to collaboratively plan differentiated learning opportunities that address student readiness, interest, and or learning profile.

Person Responsible: Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going

Utilize multiple forms of formative assessment like Dream Box and IXL to have students practice on math benchmarks aligned skills to achieve proficiency or mastery. Promote and encourage these support programs outside of the student day to extend learning.

Person Responsible: Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going

Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student data to identify and plan for differentiation opportunities based on the students' readiness, interest, and/or learning profile. Data can come from the FAST assessments, IXL, Instructional Materials assessments, and/or teacher and district formal and informal assessments.

Person Responsible: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going

Administrators and teachers engage in mathematics- focused learning walks/ discussions.

Person Responsible: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

By focusing on ensuring that whole group and small group instruction in English Language Arts in both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles, we will be able to implement aligned standards with rigorous expectations for all students in English Language Arts. Teachers will focus on instructional practices that identify critical content and engage students in complex tasks and use text to increase students background knowledge and literacy skills in social studies, science and arts in order to improve student learning and increase the overall level of proficiency in ELA across all grade levels.

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

The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 69% to 75%, as measured by the Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring assessment (F.A.S.T.)

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

STAR (K-2)
Progress Monitoring assessment (F.A.S.T.) data in grades 3-8
I-Ready

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Explicit and systematic instruction
Scaffolded instruction
Corrective feedback
Differentiated instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Explicit instructional practice for novices in learning new content, skill, or concept: 1) full, clear explanations, 2) teacher modeling, 3) Provide a "worked-out" sample with full teacher explanation, 3) Full guidance during student practice, 4) Teacher corrective feedback. Decades of research clearly demonstrate that for novices (comprising virtually all students), direct, explicit instruction is more effective and more efficient than partial guidance. Teachers are more effective when providing explicit guidance with practice and feedback rather than requiring student discovery while learning new skills/concepts. Differentiation consists of the efforts of teachers to respond to variance among learners in the classroom. Teachers can differentiate content, process, products–culminating projects that ask the student to rehearse, apply, and extend what he or she has learned in a unit; , and learning environment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Deliver explicit, step-by-step instruction—in multiple, briskly paced cycles. related to student interests & cultural backgrounds; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.

Person Responsible: Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Provide support and feedback focused on explicit, systematic and sequential approaches to reading and writing instruction including a gradual release of responsibility model of instruction.

Person Responsible: Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, 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: Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Employ benchmark aligned instructional strategies which include individual student practice. Some examples that motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to: positive expectations for success; novel tasks or other approaches to stimulate curiosity; developing a compelling introduction for each lesson: a one- or two-minute preview or "pitch" to help students see the relevance of the day's lesson; .meaningful tasks related to student interests & cultural backgrounds; thought-provoking challenges or dilemmas; analogies, metaphors, or humorous anecdotes; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices; employ simple procedures (such as proximity) for ensuring that every student is attentive during instruction—with their eyes are on the teacher, ready to learn.

Person Responsible: Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year; following each round of F.A.S.T. testing

Teachers meet in PLCs at least once per month to share ways they are incorporating HOT Qs and collaboration into their lessons and what effect placing students in the productive struggle is having on student growth. In PLCs teachers also share ways to support students who continue to struggle with engagement in collaboration around complex tasks like HOT Qs.

Person Responsible: Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly meetings ongoing throughout the year

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

By focusing on instruction, data, and differentiation practice in Science, we will improve the proficiency level of all students. Teachers will monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles. As a result, we will improve student learning and increase the overall level of proficiency in Science across all grade levels.

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

The percent of all students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 78% to 83%, as measured by the Statewide Science Assessment in May 2023.

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

Classroom observations, teacher/administrator conversations, utilizing progress monitoring assessments and tools, and teacher collaboration in common planning/ PLCs
Cycle Assessment Data
Mock SSA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teacher Clarity
Challenging Learning
Prior Ability
Classroom Discussion
Feedback

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

• Clarity around goals and making them transparent in the lesson - Goals need to be appropriately challenging and provide many opportunities to monitor progress from learner entry into the lesson towards the goals of the lesson.
• Activating prior knowledge helps students see the connections between previous learning and new instruction, builds on what students already know, provides a framework for learners to better understand new information, and gives instructors formative assessment information to adapt instruction.
• Classroom discussion involves the entire class in a discussion. The teacher stops lecturing and students get together as a class to discuss an important issue. Classroom discussion allows students to improve communication skills by voicing their opinions and thoughts. Teachers also benefit from classroom discussion as it allows them to see if students have learnt the concepts that are being taught.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

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

Person Responsible: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

During collaborative planning that occurs within school hours or after-school planning sessions, provide regular structures for planning/PLCs where teachers regularly engage in data/student work analysis as well as intellectual prep & lesson rehearsal (previewing/engaging in hands-on tasks, previewing videos and other digital resources) for upcoming lessons, including scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

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: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Strengthen student inquiry skills through the implementation and monitoring of routine use of higher-level thinking through questioning, class discussions, problem solving activities, and/or collaborative study groups.

Person Responsible: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment (unit and cycle assessments) and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions. Use this data to inform instruction.

Person Responsible: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

By focusing on instruction and differentiation of practice in Social Studies, we will improve the proficiency level of all students. Teachers will focus on instructional practices that identify critical content and engage students in
complex tasks in order to improve student learning and increase the overall level of proficiency in Social Studies across all grade levels. Teachers will monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

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

The percent of students achieving proficiency on the Civics EOC will increase from 92% to 97%, as measured by the Spring 2024 administration of the Civics EOC. The percent of students in all grade levels scoring in the "green" on Social Studies cycle assessments will be 75% or higher on all cycle assessments during the 2023-2024 school year

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

Classroom observations, teacher/administrator conversations, utilizing progress monitoring assessments and tools, and teacher collaboration in common planning/PLCs
Cycle Assessment Data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Facilitate meaningful discourse
Pose purposeful questions
Elicit and use evidence of student thinking
Scaffolded instruction
Corrective feedback
Differentiated instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Explicit instructional practice for novices in learning new content, skill, or concept: 1) full, clear explanations, 2) teacher modeling, 3) Provide a "worked-out" sample with full teacher explanation, 3) Full guidance during student practice, 4) Teacher corrective feedback. Decades of research clearly demonstrate that for novices (comprising virtually all students), direct, explicit instruction is more effective and more efficient than partial guidance. Teachers are more effective when providing explicit guidance with practice and feedback rather than requiring student discovery while learning new skills/concepts. Differentiation consists of the efforts of teachers to respond to variance among learners in the classroom. Teachers can differentiate content, process, products–culminating projects that ask the student to rehearse, apply, and extend what he or she has learned in a unit; , and learning environment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment (unit and cycle assessments) and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions.

Person Responsible: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance.

Person Responsible: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing, planning at monthly PLCs, especially following Cycle Assessment administration

Supporting reading a writing thru DBQ's, Complex Text, and Evidence based writing skills.
Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with US History teachers.
Co-professional development with ELA and Reading teachers.
Inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons that include text dependent questions, close and critical reading and skill/strategy-based groups to implement during core instruction to support success with complex texts.

Person Responsible: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing, monthly

Administrators and teachers engage in focused learning walks/ discussions.

Person Responsible: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

By focusing on building a positive, productive community to which all stakeholders feel a connection, improve the positive culture and environment of the school.

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

The percent of all students missing 10% or more days will decrease from 15% to 10%, as measured by attendance data and the Early Warning System data.

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

Attendance data is reviewed at Administration Meetings, School-Based Leadership Meetings, and Child Study Meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

In order to build a positive, productive community to which all stakeholders will feel a connection, we will implement several strategies, including Homerooms and AVID Academies. These provide each student with a connection to an adult at the school who may not be their normal classroom teacher, so that students and staff will have an opportunity to build a relationship that is not based solely on academics. In addition, opportunities for parents and families to build connections to the school community are offered through Parent University sessions to provide families with strategies to best support the success of their students, and large community events such as a Fall Festival and an annual Fish Fry.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We feel that students have high numbers of absences from school because they, and/or their families, do not feel a connection to the school community. By focusing on opportunities to build a positive, productive community to which all stakeholders feel a connection, students, and families, will want to be present at school and part of the activities offered at the school. This will help reduce the number of students with high absentee rates.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers build positive relationships and community within their classes from the first day of school to create a positive, safe culture for the school

Person Responsible: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Homeroom groups are established through the master schedule and teachers start meeting with homeroom groups at the beginning of the school year

Person Responsible: Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

By When: August/Ongoing

AVID Academy offerings are scheduled for homeroom groups monthly

Person Responsible: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly/Ongoing

Parent University Sessions are offered monthly

Person Responsible: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly/Ongoing

Large community events are offered at least twice per year

Person Responsible: Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

By When: Fall Festival - October Fish Fry - March/April

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.