

Pinellas County Schools

Pinellas Central Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 22 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 22 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 25 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Pinellas Central Elementary School

10501 58TH ST N, Pinellas Park, FL 33782

<http://www.pincen-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.

The mission of Pinellas Central Elementary is to create a safe and positive learning environment where adults and students feel valued and challenged to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Professional community of educators promoting 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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Cannata, Abigail | Principal | |
| Wager, Stephanie | Assistant Principal | |
| Swanson, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Cain, Reanna | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Herman, Jenni | Teacher, K-12 | |
| VanHorn, Morgan | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Redington, Patrice | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Robertson, Lisa | Instructional Media | |
| Odrzywolski, Mary | School Counselor | |
| Duffy, Blair | Teacher, PreK | |
| Cooman, Sarah | Teacher, ESE | |
| Coletti, Anne | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Carpenter, Jami | Paraprofessional | |

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.

Feedback and input is collected through leadership meetings and surveys. This feedback is taken into consideration to form our goals and action steps.

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 will be monitored through SIP articulation meetings held once a quarter. Teachers will align to one SIP area and will discuss current progress towards reaching goals, discuss what is going well, discuss areas that need more attention, as well as, provide feedback on next steps that need to be taken.

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 | 64% |
| 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) 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: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 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 | 5 | 24 | 22 | 18 | 17 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 20 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | 4 | 38 | 37 | 33 | 28 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 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 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| 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 | 4 | 38 | 37 | 33 | 28 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 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 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| 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* | 48 | 54 | 53 | 50 | 55 | 56 | 47 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 66 | | | 60 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 53 | | | 50 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 55 | 61 | 59 | 56 | 51 | 50 | 53 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 66 | | | 52 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 52 | | | 33 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 58 | 62 | 54 | 53 | 62 | 59 | 53 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 65 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 52 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 57 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 75 | 64 | 59 | 59 | | | 71 | | |

* 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 | 56 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 279 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 57 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 455 |
| 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 | 37 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 42 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 63 | | | |
| BLK | 34 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 51 | | | |
| MUL | 41 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | | | |
| FRL | 52 | | | |

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 | 35 | Yes | 2 | |
| ELL | 56 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 66 | | | |
| BLK | 51 | | | |
| HSP | 53 | | | |

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 | 55 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | | | |
| FRL | 55 | | | |

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 | 48 | | | 55 | | | 58 | | | | | 75 |
| SWD | 30 | | | 36 | | | 45 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 28 | | | 56 | | | 40 | | | | 5 | 75 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 43 | | | 83 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 33 | | | 32 | | | 36 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 46 | | | 51 | | | 58 | | | | 5 | 69 |
| MUL | 31 | | | 50 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | | | 63 | | | 74 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 42 | | | 48 | | | 50 | | | | 5 | 77 |

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 | 50 | 66 | 53 | 56 | 66 | 52 | 53 | | | | | 59 |
| SWD | 29 | 27 | | 41 | 40 | | 38 | | | | | |
| ELL | 47 | 68 | | 56 | 60 | | 47 | | | | | 59 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 43 | 75 | | 76 | 64 | | | | | | | 73 |

| 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 | 46 | 72 | | 37 | 70 | | 31 | | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 61 | | 52 | 54 | | | | | | | 50 |
| MUL | 45 | | | 64 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 64 | 60 | 59 | 71 | 45 | 63 | | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 65 | 52 | 47 | 65 | 54 | 49 | | | | | 65 |

| 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 | 47 | 60 | 50 | 53 | 52 | 33 | 53 | | | | | 71 |
| SWD | 36 | 46 | | 42 | 38 | | 38 | | | | | |
| ELL | 44 | 58 | | 56 | 53 | | 44 | | | | | 71 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 52 | 60 | | 52 | | | 60 | | | | | 85 |
| BLK | 27 | 50 | | 33 | 45 | | 40 | | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | 68 | | 53 | 47 | | 44 | | | | | 63 |
| MUL | 59 | | | 53 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 48 | | 62 | 52 | | 57 | | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 68 | 55 | 46 | 41 | 33 | 47 | | | | | 78 |

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 | 55% | 57% | -2% | 54% | 1% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 58% | -9% | 58% | -9% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 53% | -14% | 50% | -11% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 36% | 62% | -26% | 59% | -23% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 66% | 66% | 0% | 61% | 5% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 61% | -3% | 55% | 3% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 60% | -5% | 51% | 4% |

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.

Reading showed our lowest performance. Newer teachers that did not have a strong instructional knowledge or practices contributed to this performance.

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

3rd grade showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Newer teachers that did not have a strong instructional knowledge or practices contributed to this performance.

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.

3rd grade as a whole had the greatest gap compared to the state average in reading and math. Newer teachers that did not have a strong instructional knowledge or practices contributed to this performance.

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

Fourth grade math showed the most improvement. We placed 4th grade math teachers with proven strong instructional practices, knowledge, and understanding. They are also strong on differentiated instruction and closing academic gaps in lower performing students.

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

Two areas of concern stand out from our early warning data. We will work to decrease the number of students absent 10% or more. We will decrease the number of students scoring a level 1 on the reading and math FAST assessments.

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

1. Moving our incoming 4th graders from 41% reading proficiency to at least 55% proficiency.
2. Continuing to focus on moving all learners towards proficiency.
3. Continuing to focus on all students making one years' worth of academic success in ELA and Math.
4. Continuing to fill gaps and moving towards proficiency for ESE, ESOL, and black students.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

Retaining highly qualified teachers is important for continuity in school culture and communality. Experienced teachers have strength in pedagogy and curriculum knowledge.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Pinellas Central will retain at least 90% of its current faculty.

Monitoring:

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

We will take account of the number of faculty that choose another option outside of PCE for the 24-25 school year and will perform exit surveys for faculty that choose to pursue other options.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Abigail Cannata (cannataab@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.)

Exit Survey

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using exit surveys will provide important information/feedback to administrators in areas that need improvement, as well as, areas that are doing well.

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.

Continue implementation of school-wide student mentorship program.

Person Responsible: Abigail Cannata (cannataab@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing though May 2024

Implement regular coaching cycles for new/new to district grade level teachers.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Wager (wagers@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing by May 2024

Continue eliciting faculty feedback to create a culture and climate that is reflective of faculty ideas

Person Responsible: Abigail Cannata (cannataab@pcsb.org)

By When: on-going through summer 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group 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.

Students will be provided consistent opportunities to be successful with grade level benchmark tasks through small group instruction. Teachers will utilize collaborative planning and data chats to plan for small group focused content blocks. Through content rich and student focused small groups, academic performance and student engagement increase. Small group lessons increase engagement and academic performance.

We expect to see a 10% overall proficiency increase on PM3 FAST.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall proficiency in all content areas will increase by 10% as measured by PM3 on FAST.

Reading: 50% to 60%

Math: 57% to 67%

Science: 58% to 68%

Monitoring:

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

We will use the FAST assessment in the Fall, Winter, and Spring to monitor for our desired outcomes in Reading and Math. We will utilize data from interim assessments such as Math topic assessments and District Benchmark assessments as frequent checks for monitoring. Unit assessments, formative assessment checks and the Mock SSA will be used to monitor for desired outcomes in Science.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Wager (wagers@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 effectiveness of small group instruction using re-occurring data points to ensure students are receiving appropriate instruction and interventions during small groups. Ensure small group instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Ensuring small group instruction is aligned to student needs based on data and benchmarks will ensure that students are receiving what they need to make academic gains.

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 walk-through tool to provide timely and effective feedback to teachers for implementation of consistent small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Abigail Cannata (cannataab@pcsb.org)

By When: on-going by May 2024

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

Person Responsible: Abigail Cannata (cannataab@pcsb.org)

By When: on-going by May 2024

Implement student-led goal setting and monitoring with regular (at least bi-weekly) data-driven conversations.

Person Responsible: Abigail Cannata (cannataab@pcsb.org)

By When: on-going by May 2024

Implement additional academic supports in the classroom setting to allow for more intentional, targeted small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Abigail Cannata (cannataab@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing by May 2024

Implement consistent coaching cycles.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Wager (wagers@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing by May 2024

Utilize small group instructional practices throughout the core block.

Person Responsible: Abigail Cannata (cannataab@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing through May 2024

#3. 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.

Deepen understanding of the Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards for Mathematics, ELA, and Science to improve student outcomes. Teachers will utilize district curricular materials and Benchmarks to plan for standards aligned tasks and questions for all students.

Our rationale is to increase overall proficiency in all content areas as measured by PM 3 FAST assessment. Our overall goals are as follows,

ELA 50% to 60%

MATH 57% -67%

Science 58% to 68%

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 10% from (50% to 60%) as measured by the FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking)

Proficiency in Math will increase 10% from (57% to 67%) as measured by the FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking)

Proficiency in Science will increase 10% (from 58% to 68%) as measured by the statewide Science Assessment (SSA)

Monitoring:

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

We will use the FAST assessment in the Fall, Winter, and Spring to monitor for our desired outcomes in Reading and Math. We will utilize data from interim assessments such as Math topic assessments and District Benchmark assessments as frequent checks for monitoring. Unit assessments, formative assessment checks and the Mock SSA will be used to monitor for desired outcomes in Science.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Wager (wagers@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.)

Gain a deeper understanding of the BEST standards for improving student outcomes.

Utilize curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students. Monitor whole group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based strategy. Develop a professional learning plan that results in improved practice and better student outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Understanding the BEST standards will allow teacher a deeper understanding of what is being taught so they can deepen content and differentiate for student 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.

Instructional supports provided for all students during core instruction, differentiated instruction, and independent learning.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Wager (wagers@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Implement deeper level of questions to engage students in higher yield responses and tasks.

Person Responsible: Abigail Cannata (cannataab@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Create a schedule for weekly grade level collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Abigail Cannata (cannataab@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Make strategic decisions about curriculum implementation and utilize data to maximize student learning.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Wager (wagers@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on data, this area has a crucial need to increase overall proficiency for black students and Students with Disabilities. Data indicate a gap in proficiency between black/nonblack students, as well as, SWD.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our black students will increase their proficiency by 25% from 32% to 57% on Reading and Math from Spring 2023 to Spring 2024 as measured by the FAST. Our SWD students will increase their proficiency by 10% from 42% to 52% on Reading from Spring 2023 to Spring 2024 as measured by the FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Student performance in Reading, Math and Science will be measured by PM3 FAST/SSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Wager (wagers@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.)

Celebrate student's growth with regards to goal setting and academic progress to encourage the use of high-yield strategies and ensure continuous academic growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will increase their performance when they experience being celebrated in their success toward their academic goals.

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 goal setting opportunities where the students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals, monitoring their academic progress throughout the year, revising their goals based on data, and celebrating success.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Wager (wagers@pcsb.org)

By When: on-going by May 2024

Implement student-led conferences to allow student to share their academic goals and their progress with family members.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Wager (wagers@pcsb.org)

By When: on-going by May 2024

Create meaningful student extended learning opportunities to enrich and remediate skills.

Person Responsible: Blair Duffy (duffybl@pcsb.org)

By When: on-going 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)).

Surveys are created and given to faculty to assess the current resources and needs of students. Data is reviewed. SBLT reviews and votes on expenditures aligned to our SIP for the improvement of student academic performance.

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, professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

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

Continue focusing on benchmark-aligned instruction, deeper levels of questioning/tasks, and intentional small-group instruction

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

- 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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension, administrator walk throughs, academic increase in learning gains and proficiency on PM2 and PM3 FAST

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.

STAR Literacy/FAST - data will impact student's interventions in an effort to move towards proficiency

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Doege Bayliss, Johanna, doegej@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 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>o 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 | Cannata, Abigail, cannataab@pcsb.org |
| <p>o 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. | Doege Bayliss, Johanna, doegej@pcsb.org |
| <p>o 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. | Wager, Stephanie, wagers@pcsb.org |
| <p>o 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. | Cannata, Abigail, cannataab@pcsb.org |

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.

The SIP is shared with staff at the welcome back meeting. It is shared with PTA and SAC in the beginning of the year. SIP overview pages are provided for parents and community members in the front office.

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))

A calendar has been created that has monthly events to provide opportunities for families to join us on campus. Family nights, curriculum nights, student led conferences, and student award ceremonies are planned.

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)

Our school plans to strengthen our academic program by establishing a calendar for collaborative planning for all grade levels. Engaging benchmark-based tasks will be planned along with higher order questions to increase critical thinking for all content areas. Academic data will be monitored and used to plan for small group instruction for acceleration.

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))

NA