

Pinellas County Schools

Bay Point 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	28

Bay Point Elementary School

5800 22ND ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

<http://www.baypoint-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.

To prepare scholars for success through high expectations and rich, varied, and relevant experiences. We aim to develop critical thinkers in collaboration with staff and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Scholar 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
Proctor, Phytheria	Principal	Facilitates and monitors the execution and implementation process of School Improvement Plan.
Johannessen, Brooke	Assistant Principal	Supports execution, monitoring and implementation process of School Improvement Plan.
Negretti, Ciera	Magnet Coordinator	Works directly with the school-based leadership team (SBLT) and classroom teachers in assisting with the full implementation and monitoring of interventions needed for scholar achievement.
Nemeth, Anne-Marie	Math Coach	Works directly with the school-based leadership team (SBLT) and classroom teachers in assisting with the full implementation and monitoring of the district's adopted math program in response to intervention needed for scholar achievement.
Stroemich, Kelly	Science Coach	Works directly with the school-based leadership team (SBLT) and classroom teachers in assisting with the full implementation and monitoring of the district's adopted science program in response to intervention needed for scholar achievement.
Fischer, Kyle	School Counselor	Promotes scholar success while providing preventive services, and responding to identified scholar needs through the implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program that addresses academic, personal and social development for all scholars.
Schaefer, Merrideth	Reading Coach	Works directly with the school-based leadership team (SBLT) and classroom teachers in assisting with the full implementation and monitoring of the district's adopted ELA program in response to intervention needed for scholar achievement.
Sakovich, Ilona	Other	Works to support the success of scholars academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally. Collaborates with educators, parents, and other professionals to create safe, healthy, and supportive learning environments that strengthen connections between home, school, and the community for all scholars. Identifies and assesses the learning, development, and adjustment characteristics and needs of individuals and groups, as well as the environmental factors that affect learning and adjustment. Provides interventions to scholars to support the teaching

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		process and to maximize learning and adjustments. Assists in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs to meet identified learning and adjustment needs. Delivers a planned and coordinated program of psychological services.
Jones, Ali	Psychologist	Works to support the success of scholars academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally. Collaborates with educators, parents, and other professionals to create safe, healthy, and supportive learning environments that strengthen connections between home, school, and the community for all students. Identifies and assesses the learning, development, and adjustment characteristics and needs of individuals and groups, as well as, the environmental factors that affect learning and adjustment. Provides interventions to students to support the teaching process and to maximize learning and adjustment. Assists in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs to meet identified learning and adjustment needs. Delivers a planned and coordinated program of psychological services.

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's Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) met preschool to review data and establish goals. We began drafting action steps. During preschool, the SIP goals and drafted action steps are being presented to staff to review and revise as needed. The drafted SIP will be presented to SAC for feedback and suggestions. A data presentation night will be held with parents where the SIP will be presented. Families will be divided into groups based on goals to provide feedback.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored during SBLT and team leader meetings. The goals and action steps will also be reviewed and revised during administrative PLCs and data chats. This will take place after assessment periods.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	91%
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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: D
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	0	17	22	10	10	14	0	0	0	73	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	6	5	2	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	9	4	9	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	16	16	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	14	12	0	0	0	32	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	5	8	10	0	0	0	24

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	24	18	17	16	19	0	0	0	95	
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	2	2	2	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	7	4	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	32	24	0	0	0	88	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	30	47	0	0	0	100	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	2	5	7	3	3	0	0	0	25	

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	3	4	10	10	12	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	1	24	18	17	16	19	0	0	0	95	
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	2	2	2	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	7	4	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	32	24	0	0	0	88	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	30	47	0	0	0	100	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	2	5	7	3	3	0	0	0	25	

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	3	4	10	10	12	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	17
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*	40	54	53	47	55	56	39		
ELA Learning Gains				64			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			41		
Math Achievement*	50	61	59	51	51	50	44		
Math Learning Gains				47			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30			35		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	50	62	54	47	62	59	44		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		64	59						

* 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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	179
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	340
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	17	Yes	2	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	60			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

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	21	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	70			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	43			

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	40			50			50					
SWD	13			17							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			46			44				4	
HSP	50			69							2	
MUL	42			58							2	
PAC												
WHT	50			55			60				3	
FRL	34			45			42				4	

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	47	64	54	51	47	30	47					
SWD	14	37		22	30		0					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	59	53	43	41	27	36					
HSP	52	70		67	80		80					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	57	82		73	59							
FRL	40	59	50	44	40	30	35					

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	39	48	41	44	56	35	44					
SWD	7	50		22	50		18					
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	47	43	37	52	35	37					
HSP	57			57								
MUL	55			45								
PAC												
WHT	58			74								
FRL	33	44	39	41	55	40	40					

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	39%	57%	-18%	54%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	58%	-3%	58%	-3%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	53%	-15%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	48%	62%	-14%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	66%	-5%	61%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	61%	-17%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	50%	60%	-10%	51%	-1%

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 was our lowest performing area with 45% proficiency. Contributing factors include numerous novice teachers, lack of full-time reading coach, ineffective collaborative planning, and scholar behaviors. These factors can be attributed to having 23 brand new staff members and many of them lacked the classroom management necessary to provide quality and effective teaching and learning.

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

ELA showed the greatest decline from 47% to 45% proficiency. This can be attributed to the factors listed above specifically an entire new team of teachers in 5th grade. Also, the absence of writing scores calculated into the overall ELA grade. This was also the first-year scholars took the test on the computer which was a huge shift from paper-based.

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.

Our biggest gap from the state average was 5th grade ELA. We had 39% proficiency while the state had 54%. This is a gap of 15%. Again, we had a brand-new 5th grade team last school year. One of our most struggling novice teachers was teaching 2/3 of our 5th grade scholars in ELA. Also, due to being brand new, scholar behaviors were a huge problem in 5th grade. All of this contributed to this gap.

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

5th grade science showed the most improvement. We had 47% proficiency in 2022, last year we had 50%. This 3% increase was due in part to the work of our science coach. She lead the work with teachers through analyzing data to fill in gaps, pulled small groups daily, co-taught lessons, and emphasized science vocabulary.

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

Attendance of scholars with 10% or more days absent in 1st and 2nd grade is the primary area of concern.

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

- 1) increase ELA, math, and science proficiencies for all scholars
- 2) increase teacher capacity around best instructional practices
- 3) increase teacher capacity around classroom management
- 4) decrease number of scholars with 10% or more absences
- 5) increase proficiency and learning gains in SWDs

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.

Based on the 2023 FAST Assessment, our scholars performed below the state and district averages in ELA, math, and science. All of our core subject areas need to improve in proficiency. The problem/gap is occurring due to inconsistent use of benchmark-based instructional best practice and inconsistent use of data. This will be addressed by school leadership through early intervention of staff in the professional development of state benchmarks and curriculum materials. This way gaps can be filled early and teachers needing additional support can be identified earlier.

This gap also exists due to teachers having limited effective teaching methods to support learning.

Coaching support will be provided by content area specialists and administration in the areas of modeling quality core instruction, intentional collaborative planning, and data analysis that leads to differentiation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency will increase by 5% (45% to 50%) as measured by the 2024 PM 3 FAST Assessment.

ELA proficiency will increase by 6% (39% to 45%) as measured by the 2025 PM 3 FAST Assessment.

Math proficiency will increase by 7% (51% to 58%) as measured by the 2024 PM 3 FAST Assessment.

Science proficiency will increase by 5% (50% to 55%) as measured by the 2024 SSA.

Monitoring:

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

Ongoing monitoring of EOY outcomes will occur during grade level data chats, and productive collaborative planning sessions. Instructional rounds and weekly walkthroughs with timely and constructive feedback will also guide quality core instruction. Ongoing monitoring through intervention programs such as Istation and Dreambox will also take place.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Merrideth Schaefer (schaeferme@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.)

Support and strengthen staff ability to analyze and incorporate data into instruction. Support and coach teachers around best instructional practices and the ability to grow from feedback. Grade level instructional staff will engage in collaborative planning time with the school's full-time content area coaches focused on scholar data for the understanding and planning of the B.E.S.T. benchmarks/FSASS and tasks to increase rigorous scholar-centered differentiation to meet scholar academic needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through our weekly walkthrough observations and EOY data, we have concluded that core instruction needs to be our primary focus. Through continuing walkthroughs with timely and constructive feedback, as well as effective collaborative planning sessions, our teachers will be given the opportunity to grow and enhance their teaching skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Ensure all staff have a deep understanding of Pre-K through 5 B.E.S.T. Benchmarks and FSASS.

Person Responsible: Kelly Stroemich (stroemichk@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Weekly instructional walk throughs conducted by the ILT and administration monitoring of collaborative planning sessions.

Person Responsible: Phyleria Proctor (proctorph@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Provide quality and relevant professional development in the areas of classroom management, math, science, ELA, data analysis, and scholar engagement through quality core instruction.

Person Responsible: Brooke Johannessen (johannessenb@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Provide coaching support by content area experts.

Person Responsible: Merrideth Schaefer (schaeferme@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Ensure effective collaborative planning practices are taking place weekly.

Person Responsible: Brooke Johannessen (johannessenb@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Teachers will plan with the B1G-M as this will be the best way to ensure target/task alignment and differentiation.

Person Responsible: Anne-Marie Nemeth (nemetha@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

This is an area of focus for Bay Point, as culture and community have been on the decline for many years. Contributing factors to this decline include staff turnover, lack of parent involvement, and scant community partnerships. In order to progress, an emphasis will be placed on staff recruitment and retention. Scholar and staff accountability was not held to highest expectations, creating a lack of urgency when confronted with behavioral and academic concerns. Under new administration, our goal is to strengthen partnerships with all stakeholders. These partnerships will create a safe, healthy and secure culture that promotes scholar success.

Parent Involvement will be encouraged and promoted by offering more opportunities for parents to attend campus events and facilitate open communication between all stakeholders. Ensure parents have ample opportunity to provide feedback in the development and decision-making process of activities related to the school.

The number of community partnerships will grow and enhance the school through enriching opportunities for all involved. Ways partnerships will enhance the school community include potential sponsorships for student of the month, content initiatives, staff incentives, etc.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teacher retention and positive climate surveys demonstrate positive culture and climate. Attendance at family events will improve, and family climate surveys will reflect positive culture.

Monitoring:

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

Climate surveys for both staff, scholars and families will show positive trends. Monitoring attendance of on-campus events, growth of parent volunteer group, and a more active PTA. SBLT will regularly monitor minor/major infraction data and monitor the scholar point system based on the tier 1 PBIS plan.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

1. Expectations and rules are developed and effective procedures for dealing with discipline are reinforced.
2. Expectations for scholars are clearly defined, taught, and reinforced.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strategies and actions are based on research and evidence-based nationally recognized programs (PBIS Restorative Practices, Responsive Classroom). The specific strategies and actions within our SIP were selected to match our school-specific needs based on our review of data.

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 staff will be trained on effective classroom management techniques and how to develop to teach and re-teach expectations.

Person Responsible: Kyle Fischer (fischerky@pcsb.org)

By When: This support will be ongoing.

Prior to the first day of school with scholars, the PBIS coordinator will use the Tier 1 Walkthrough Tool to ensure signage reflecting Guidelines for Success (expectations) is posted in all classrooms and common areas.

stakeholders

Person Responsible: Brooke Johannessen (johannessenb@pcsb.org)

By When: This support will be ongoing.

The Panther Bucks Store, BPE Jamboree and our schoolwide system of recognition/rewards, will continue as an incentive to celebrate scholars for their demonstration of the Guidelines for Success. New staff and substitutes will be trained on the implementation of our PBIS program

Person Responsible: Kyle Fischer (fischerky@pcsb.org)

By When: This support will be ongoing.

Continue to maintain and promote a positive culture and environment with all stakeholders.

Person Responsible: Phyteria Proctor (proctorph@pcsb.org)

By When: This support will be ongoing.

Ensure instruction is matched for scholar success.

Person Responsible: Merrideth Schaefer (schaeferme@pcsb.org)

By When: This support is ongoing

#3. 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.

Based on the 2021-2022 state assessment data, our SWD scholars scored below the 41% Federal Index with a score of 21%. Our SWD scholars scored well below the 41% in all content areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD scholars will increase proficiency in ELA by 27% (14% to 41%) as measured by the 2024 FAST Assessment.

SWD scholars will increase proficiency in math by 19% (22% to 41%) as measured by the 2024 FAST Assessment.

SWD scholars will increase proficiency in science by 41% (0% to 41%) as measured by the 2024 FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Ongoing monitoring of end of the year outcomes will occur during grade level data chats where VE resource teachers, gen ed teachers, content coaches, and admin will all be present. ILT will engage staff in PD with a focus of on the use of equitable teaching strategies. Admin will monitor the effectiveness of ESE services through weekly walkthroughs and formative data and adjust as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Phyteria Proctor (proctorph@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.)

Ensure that an inclusion model where both gen ed and VE resource teachers intentionally plan for the differentiated needs of each scholar to ensure content is accessible to all. Cultivate a school-wide mindset that ensures teachers are engaging in equitable teaching practices (equitable grading, culturally relevant teaching, restorative practices, etc) through intentional planning and ensuring that all scholars are engaged in rigorous grade level course work.

Based on the learning gains and trend data of schools with similar ESE populations; school leaders shared that implementing an inclusion (push-in) model with a focus on differentiation, scaffolded instruction and PD on tools for modifications to instructional strategies with co-planning as a major contributing factor to increased improvement of SWD scholars.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As educators, we are obligated to ensure that scholars are provided multiple opportunities to engage in rigorous, grade level benchmark-based teaching and learning. Our current data illustrates that SWD scholars are under performing in all content areas (ELA, math and science) in comparison to their gen ed counterparts.

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.

Engage staff in monthly PD around equitable practices and differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Brooke Johannessen (johannessenb@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Weekly walkthroughs and actionable feedback provided to both gen ed and VE teachers by ILT.

Person Responsible: Phyteria Proctor (proctorph@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Biweekly monitoring of SWD scholar data by gen ed teachers, VE teachers, and admin.

Person Responsible: Brooke Johannessen (johannessenb@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Ensure instructional supports are in place during core instruction and independent practice for scholars with exceptional needs. These supports include access to grade level content with appropriate scaffolds.

Person Responsible: Phyteria Proctor (proctorph@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Provide opportunities for VE teachers, gen ed teachers, and content area coaches to co-plan for differentiated instruction and support delivery of services.

Person Responsible: Phyteria Proctor (proctorph@pcsb.org)

By When: 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).

Allocation decisions will be aligned to district processes.

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

ELA proficiency will increase by 5% (45% to 50%) as measured by the 2024 PM 3 FAST Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

ELA proficiency will increase by 5% (45% to 50%) as measured by the 2024 PM 3 FAST Assessment.

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.

Ongoing monitoring of EOY outcomes will occur during grade level data chats, and productive collaborative planning sessions. Instructional rounds and weekly walkthroughs with timely and constructive feedback will also guide quality core instruction. Ongoing monitoring through intervention programs such as Istation and Dreambox will also take place.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Schaefer, Merrideth, schaeferme@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 scholars 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 scholars 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> <p>? 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.</p> <p>? 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.</p> <p>? School Literacy Leadership Team plan family reading nights grounded in family friendly evidence-based practices to support the homeschool connection</p>	<p>Johannessen, Brooke, johannessenb@pcsb.org</p>
<p>o Literacy Coaching</p> <p>? Literacy coaches work with school principals to plan and implement consistent professional learning using strategies that demonstrate a significant effect on improving student outcomes.</p> <p>? 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.</p> <p>? Literacy coaches support and train teachers to administer assessments, analyze data and use data to differentiate instruction.</p>	<p>Schaefer, Merrideth, schaeferme@pcsb.org</p>
<p>o Professional learning</p> <p>? 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.</p> <p>? School-based teams are provided professional learning sessions on the science of reading and evidence-based literacy instruction, materials, and assessment.</p> <p>? 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>	<p>Proctor, Phyteria, proctorph@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.

The SIP will be shared with stakeholders during Open House/Title 1 Compact Meeting and during the first SAC and PTA Meetings. It will also be dissemination and discussed during preschool with all staff present. Our SIP one-pager will be posted to our school webpage, dojo, school messenger, and Facebook. We will also share information from our SIP with scholar leaders during our first Student Council Meeting in August. These leaders will be tasked with sharing this information with their peers.

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))

We plan to build positive relationships with all stakeholders through open and constant communication. We plan to seek input from our families and community through PTA and SAC meetings. We also plan to welcome families on campus many times throughout the year for exciting events.

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 academic program will be tightly monitored by admin and content area coaches for effectiveness towards end of the year goals and be adjusted as needed. Gen ed and VE resource teachers will engage in weekly collaborative planning sessions to accelerate learning for all scholars. Admin and content area coaches will also engage staff in monthly PD around equitable, rigorous, and data-driven instruction. We will also ensure that communication around scholar performance is constant and accessible to all families. We will strategically target specific scholars for Promise Time and other extended learning opportunities.

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

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

NA

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

NA

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

NA

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No