
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	29
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Lynch Elementary School

1901 71ST AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33702

<http://www.lynch-es.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.

We will prepare every student for college, career and citizenship by providing quality educational experiences and integrating literacy through all disciplines.

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
Williams-Macon, Brandie	Principal	Performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, safety, budget, purchasing, public relations, plant operations, food service, and transportation. Responsible for the total operational management of the school.
Carlson, Tabatha	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal serves as liaison between principal and other school personnel. This administrator assumes any duties assigned by the Principal and is fully responsible for the school program in the absence of the Principal.
Andujar, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	Instructional classroom teacher with the responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of students.
Arostegui, Ruth	Teacher, K-12	Instructional classroom teacher with the responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of students.
Wheeler, Kenya	Teacher, K-12	Instructional classroom teacher with the responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of students.
Baldwin, Stacia	Other	To facilitate the implementation of the problem-solving process with the school-based team and all school staff. This is an instructional position with responsibility for and directing the learning experiences of pupils in a group or class within an elementary school.
Dawkins, Kahlilah	Psychologist	Instructional support staff position, which provides comprehensive psychological services for students experiencing learning and behavioral problems and for students exhibiting high-level abilities and talents. Comprehensive psychological services include formal and informal assessment, counseling, behavior management, consultation, research and in-service training.
Jackson, Janet	Teacher, K-12	Instructional classroom teacher with the responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of students.
	School Counselor	Provides a comprehensive school counseling program that assists all students in acquiring the skills and knowledge to maximize highest student achievement in a safe learning environment. Responsibilities may vary depending upon the specific work setting and counselor-to-student ratio and should correspond to the needs and priorities established in the schools' and district's counseling program.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Felmine, Shyrelle	Teacher, K-12	Instructional classroom teacher with the responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of students.

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 held meetings with stakeholder groups including School Advisory Council, Parent Teacher Association, School-Based Leadership Team, and grade level Professional Learning Communities to analyze available progress monitoring data to garner input for the development of the 2023-2024 SIP.

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))

SIP monitoring will occur monthly during SBLT and SAC meetings to determine progress made towards effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of student in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. We will update the plan midyear to ensure continuous improvement.

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)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)* English Language Learners (ELL)* 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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
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	40	27	23	26	27	24	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	5	2	12	6	9	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	5	2	12	6	9	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	19	20	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	36	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	12	9	3	5	5	0	0	0	38

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	6	7	0	0	0	14

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	28	20	26	26	25	30	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	10	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	8	24	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	19	20	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	36	0	0	0	58
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	
	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	1	0	0	1	9	16	0	0	0	27

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) 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	28	20	26	26	25	30	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	10	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	8	24	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	19	20	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	36	0	0	0	58
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	
	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	1	0	0	1	9	16	0	0	0	27

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	

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*	50	54	53	45	55	56	38		
ELA Learning Gains				44			35		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			38		
Math Achievement*	58	61	59	53	51	50	47		
Math Learning Gains				47			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			31		
Science Achievement*	54	62	54	47	62	59	56		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	92	64	59	50			63		

* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	313
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	57			
AMI				
ASN	46			
BLK	50			
HSP	44			
MUL	59			
PAC				

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%
WHT	60			
FRL	62			

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	46			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	41			

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	50			58			54					92
SWD	35			70							3	
ELL	33			47							3	92
AMI												
ASN	42			50							2	
BLK	41			48							3	
HSP	38			50							2	

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
MUL	67			50							2	
PAC												
WHT	55			65			61				4	
FRL	48			56			56				5	91

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	45	44	45	53	47	38	47					50
SWD	29	48		54	50		17					
ELL	44	46		37	21							50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	41		50	57		33					
HSP	44	50		55	32		50					
MUL	45			45								
PAC												
WHT	50	46	38	53	47	24	47					
FRL	42	36	29	48	44	43	41					46

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	38	35	38	47	37	31	56					63
SWD	19			55								
ELL	40	55		38	30		60					63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	38		40	36		43					
HSP	41			44								64
MUL	55			60								
PAC												
WHT	42	37		48	43		67					70

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
FRL	32	31	36	43	31	27	50					61

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	48%	57%	-9%	54%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	58%	-8%	58%	-8%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	53%	3%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	68%	62%	6%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	66%	-5%	61%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	61%	-21%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	60%	-4%	51%	5%

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.

ELA demonstrated 53% proficiency, which is lower than Science by 1% (54), and mathematics by 7% (60). The contributing factor to the low performance is that there was a stronger focus in understanding mathematics instruction with new materials and benchmarks.

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

21-22 scores indicated 45% in ELA, in 47% Science, and 53% in mathematics. There was no decline in any of the subject areas.

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.

Information not available at this time.

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

ELA had the greatest improvement with an 8%age point increase. Administrative walkthroughs, focused collaborative planning and data analysis

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

Our potential areas of concern were students that were failing courses as well as students with multiple indicators, including attendance.

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

Our highest priorities include:

*Benchmark-aligned instruction.

*High yield instructional strategies that result in students doing the work of the lesson.

*Intentional efforts to build classroom communities and foster a a sense of belonging for all students to diminish the behavioral issues and improve the learning environment.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

Benchmarks/Standards-based data (SSA, FAST, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2022-2023 school year showed approximately half of the students performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade appropriate benchmarks/standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with benchmarks/standards-aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective and engaging teaching methods to support learning.

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 from 54% to 60% as measured by SSA.

Overall proficiency in English Language Arts will increase from 53% to 60% as measured by PM3 FAST testing.

Grade 3 proficiency in ELA will increase from 57% to 70% as measured by the PM3 FAST testing.

Overall proficiency in Mathematics will increase from 60% to 65% as measured by FAST testing.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through interim formative assessments including content area assessments, and FAST progress monitoring cycles. Monitoring will also occur during weekly PLCs through formative assessment data analysis. Appropriate coaching along with actionable feedback with follow-up will be provided to identified instructional personnel as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandie Williams-Macon (williams-maconb@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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If teachers deliver content area instruction designed according to research-based principles. For example, the teaching follows the "gradual release of responsibility" model of teaching, then students will demonstrate mastery of subject area content.

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.

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: Brandie Williams-Macon (williams-maconb@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly through May 2024

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: Tabatha Carlson (carlsont@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly through May 2024

Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to: positive expectations for success; novel tasks or other approaches to stimulate curiosity; meaningful tasks 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: Tabatha Carlson (carlsont@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly through May 2024

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: Brandie Williams-Macon (williams-maconb@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly through May 2024

Implement and monitor the use of routine writing in all content areas; including Learning Logs, Quick Writes, Annotating the text, Creating One Pagers, Reflection prompts, DLIQ (Do-Learn-Interesting?Questioning) and/or KWLA (Know-Want to Know-Learned-)charts.

Person Responsible: Brandie Williams-Macon (williams-maconb@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly through May 2024

Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark in the early grades, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.

Person Responsible: Kahlilah Dawkins (dawkinsk@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly through May 2024

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Benchmark/standards-based data (FAST, unit assessments, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2022-23 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with benchmark/standards-aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with Disabilities' proficiency levels in ELA/Math/Science will increase by 10%, as measured by FAST testing and SSA respectively. (2023 FAST and SSA data is unavailable as of 7-17-23).

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through interim unit assessments including content area and diagnostic assessment data, FAST cycle assessments, and consistent walkthroughs with feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tabatha Carlson (carlsont@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.)

Students requiring ESE services work toward mastery of meaningful Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

Ensure that students requiring ESE services receive instruction designed to teach students to advocate for their academic, social, and emotional needs.

Ensure that SWD are provided with quality behavioral and/or academic strategies that are designed to reduce discipline/disproportionate placement in ESE programs.

Continuous walkthroughs by administration to ensure that SWD are engaging in rigorous, grade-level content and providing instructional staff with strategies and professional development to support teachers and scholars.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If students' core instruction and interventions are rigorous and engaging and meet their needs as identified through their Individualized Education Plan (IEP), they should be able to demonstrate at least one year's worth of learning gains as evidenced through progress monitoring.

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.

Implement inclusive scheduling for SED and inclusion delivery model of instruction.

Person Responsible: Kahlilah Dawkins (dawkinsk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

Monitor the IEP of each student to ensure interventions meet the IEP goals.

Person Responsible: Kahlilah Dawkins (dawkinsk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

Provide benchmark-based, data-driven intensive corrective interventions during the school day through differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Brandie Williams-Macon (williams-maconb@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024.

Schedule weekly structured, collaborative planning sessions.

Person Responsible: Brandie Williams-Macon (williams-maconb@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly through May 2024.

Ensure instructional supports are in a place during core instruction and independent practice for students with exceptional needs. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as small group instruction based on data.

Person Responsible: Brandie Williams-Macon (williams-maconb@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024.

Create a climate where IEPs are adjusted as needed based on the data and needs of students to maximize the SDI based on skill deficits and improvements so that regular and purposeful adjustments can be made.

Person Responsible: Brandie Williams-Macon (williams-maconb@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

Data collected through School-Based Leadership Team brainstorming, stakeholder surveys, Office Discipline Referral (ODR) data, and Tier 1 data (ClassDojo) showed that classroom behavior issues are impeding the learning environment at the Tier 1 level.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Last year, 57.9% of students in grades K -2 had a percentile ranking of 40% or higher according to Progress Monitoring Cycle 3. Our goal is for 65% of students in grades k-2 to have a percentile ranking of 40% or higher on 2024 Progress Monitoring Cycle 3.

Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)

The percent of all students achieving English Language Arts proficiency will increase 10% as measured by FAST progress monitoring cycle 3. (Current data unavailable as of 7-17-23).

Last year, ODRs increased by 48% according to data available on the PBIS website. Our goal is to decrease ODRs administered to students by 25% by the end of the 2023-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through weekly entry of Tier 1 data in ClassDojo, bi-weekly analysis of ODRs distributed and monthly Tier 1 conversations with the School-Based Leadership Team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tabatha Carlson (carlsont@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.)

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) will be utilized to include deliberate strategies to build classroom relationships and community, ensuring an environment for fair and equitable disciplinary practices for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A school-wide commitment to our Guidelines for Success follow the acronym PRIDE (Positive Attitude, Respect, Integrity, Determination, and Empathy). Our token economy and celebrations all align to these success criteria and will keep the focus on the positive behaviors students are exhibiting.

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.

Weekly celebrations and opportunities for students to "spend" their points collected throughout the week. (token economy)

Person Responsible: Tabatha Carlson (carlsont@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly through May 2024

An intentional attempt to build classroom communities and relationships through utilization of Harmony SEL and restorative practices.

Person Responsible: Tabatha Carlson (carlsont@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

Continue to build a culture of belongingness for all students through PD designed around our previous year book study, Belonging Through a Culture of Dignity.

Person Responsible: Ruth Arostegui (arosteguir@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly through May 2024.

Continued commitment to restorative practice and teacher supports where needed.

Person Responsible: Ruth Arostegui (arosteguir@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024.

Implementation of AVID strategies to engage all learners, materials, and training in support of rigorous, engaging instruction in all classrooms and restorative practices that reward both staff and students toward focus.

Person Responsible: Tabatha Carlson (carlsont@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**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.

Benchmarks-based assessment data (FAST) collected from the 2022-2023 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA and Math with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with benchmarks aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support EL learners.

Measurable Outcome:

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

EL student proficiency in ELA/Math/Science will increase by 10%, as measured by FAST testing and SSA respectively. (2023 FAST and SSA data is unavailable as of 7-17-23).

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through interim formative assessments including content area assessments, ISIP monthly assessments, and FAST testing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tabatha Carlson (carlsont@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.)

Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. Enhance their knowledge of our ELL students language access level to so they provide scaffolds to reach these complex tasks.

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/ scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If students' core instruction and interventions are rigorous and engaging and meet their needs as identified through data analysis, they should be able to demonstrate at minimum one year's worth of learning gains as evidenced through progress monitoring.

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.

Classroom teachers will implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans with ongoing feedback from Administration and Equity Champions.

Person Responsible: Brandie Williams-Macon (williams-maconb@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

Classroom teachers will utilize student data tracking folders for goal setting and action planning for each student. Grade levels will host family nights that focus on strategies families can use to help scholars academically and behaviorally. The school will also hold two conference nights to share this data with families individually.

Person Responsible: Tabatha Carlson (carlsont@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

Create a schedule for the Bilingual Assistant to directly support standards-based instruction for ELs [provide support and PD and establish clear expectations with accountability]

Person Responsible: Brandie Williams-Macon (williams-maconb@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

Create a plan for each student coded LY and LF to receive appropriate testing accommodations starting day one for each assessment; create a plan for monitoring

Person Responsible: Tabatha Carlson (carlsont@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

Ensure that interventions include specific accommodations to meet the needs of ELs.

Person Responsible: Tabatha Carlson (carlsont@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

Develop and implement an effective process to distribute information on language proficiency levels and length of time in U.S. schools information and data for each student coded LY to each teacher who works with the student.

Person Responsible: Tabatha Carlson (carlsont@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

Provide learning opportunities for teachers and staff on the use of the WIDA Ellevation reports, Can-Do Approach and MPIs to support differentiated planning and instruction, based on ELs' language proficiency levels and needs.

Person Responsible: Tabatha Carlson (carlsont@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

Develop and implement an effective process of monitoring that WIDA Can Do Descriptors and Model Performance Indicators (MPIs) are utilized in each classroom with LY students to plan and deliver effective and comprehensible instruction to ELs at their level of English language proficiency with ongoing feedback.

Person Responsible: Tabatha Carlson (carlsont@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

Benchmarks-based assessment data (FAST) collected from the 2022-2023 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA and Math with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with benchmarks aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support Black/African-American learners.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Black/African-American student proficiency in ELA/Math/Science will increase by 140%%, as measured by FAST testing and SSA respectively from 37% to 52%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through interim formative assessments including content area assessments, ISIP monthly assessments, and FAST testing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandie Williams-Macon (williams-maconb@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.)

Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. Enhance their knowledge of our Black/African-American students language access level to so they provide scaffolds to reach these complex tasks.

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If students' core instruction and interventions are rigorous and engaging and meet their needs as identified through data analysis, they should be able to demonstrate at minimum one year's worth of learning gains as evidenced through progress monitoring.

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.

Provide benchmark-based, data-driven intensive corrective interventions during the school day through differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Brandie Williams-Macon (williams-maconb@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to: positive expectations for success; novel tasks or other approaches to stimulate curiosity; meaningful tasks 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: Brandie Williams-Macon (williams-maconb@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

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).

Our Leadership Team, along with our team leaders have analyzed the state data to determine the best way to allocate school improvement funding and Title I funding in an effort to build capacity and close learning gaps. We will continue to monitor progress towards these goals in weekly grade level PLCs dedicated to each subject area and through weekly school-based leadership team meetings to monitor Tiered data.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

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

Strategically focus on 3-5 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, 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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Each scholar in grades K-2 will be administered the Early Literacy Formative Assessment Check (ELFAC) . Interventive plans and progress monitoring will be put into place for identified student. The expectation is that over 50% of student in grades K-2 will be proficient in ELA as a result of core instruction and interventions.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In 3rd grade data from Early Literacy Formative Assessment Check (ELFAC) coupled with the core phonics survey will be used to make intervention decisions. Through interventions and strong core instruction, assessment, and monitoring over 50% of 3rd - 5th scholars will be proficient by PM3.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Our Area of Focus will be through learning communities that integrate the six components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language, comprehension, and vocabulary) into an explicit, systematic, and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies outlined in the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative.

Classroom walkthroughs and formative assessment data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Williams, Brandi, williamsbran@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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?

- o Provides print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction
- o Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words
- o Reinforce the effectiveness of instruction in alphabets, fluency, and vocabulary
- o Provide instruction in broad oral language skills
- o Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies
- o Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

To develop literacy, students need instruction in two related sets of skills: foundational reading skills and reading comprehension skills. Employing the evidence-based strategies and action steps will enable students to read words (alphabets), relate those words to their oral language, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency to understand what they read.

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

<p>Literacy Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? School Literacy Leadership Teams are meeting regularly to look at data to make informed decisions about what professional learning and supports need to be in place to maximize student growth in reading. ? Build capacity by identifying teachers, coaches and district staff who can support training in the use of evidence-based curriculum, instruction, and intervention aligned to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. ? School Literacy Leadership Team plan family reading nights grounded in family friendly evidence-based practices to support the homeschool connection 	<p>Williams-Macon, Brandie, williams-maconb@pcsb.org</p>
--	--

<p>Literacy Coaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Literacy coaches work with school principals to plan and implement consistent professional learning using strategies that demonstrate a significant effect on improving student outcomes. ? Literacy coaches prioritize time to those teachers, activities, and roles that will have the greatest impact on student achievement in reading, namely coaching, modeling, and mentoring in classrooms daily. ? Literacy coaches support and train teachers to administer assessments, analyze data and use data to differentiate instruction. 	<p>Williams-Macon, Brandie, williams-maconb@pcsb.org</p>
---	--

<p>Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Develop a structure for ongoing formative assessment is in place to determine where instruction should be modified to meet individual student needs ? Determine a structure for conducting screening, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessments is in place to identify students with a substantial deficiency in reading. 	<p>Williams-Macon, Brandie, williams-maconb@pcsb.org</p>
--	--

<p>Professional learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are guided by assessment data and are ongoing, engaging, interactive, collaborative, and job-embedded and provide time for teachers to collaborate, research, conduct lesson studies, and plan instruction. ? School-based teams are provided professional learning sessions on the science of reading and evidence-based literacy instruction, materials, and assessment. ? School-based teams provide training to teachers that integrate the six components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language, comprehension, and vocabulary) into an explicit, systematic, and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies. 	<p>Williams-Macon, Brandie, williams-maconb@pcsb.org</p>
--	--

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Electronic dissemination through school messenger to parents and staff.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

For staff, it will be discussed during grade level professional school learning communities, school-based learning communities meetings, GOLD team meetings, etc. It will be distributed to families and community members through School Advisory Council and Parent Teacher Association meetings.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school by monitoring the teaching and learning environment through administrative walkthroughs with actionable feedback to improve the learning outcomes. The school will also engage in grade level instructional walkthroughs to identify and utilize best practices and high yield strategies.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A