
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	29
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	29
VI. Title I Requirements	32
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Sawgrass Lake Elementary School

1815 77TH AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33702

<http://www.sawgrass-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 Sawgrass Lake Elementary is to educate, nurture, and inspire our students and staff to attain their goals each year to become lifelong learners, prepared for tomorrow's world

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% student success

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hill, Jessica	Principal	
Blanco, Rachelle	Teacher, K-12	
Lightfoot, Amy	Instructional Coach	
Leech, Melissa	School Counselor	
Maxon, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	
Winsor, Heather	Behavior Specialist	
Piazza, Marissa	Teacher, K-12	

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.

Grade level teams completed a SIP data problem solving worksheet to provide input based on their data.

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 is monitored for effective implementation through ongoing progress monitoring and data review. Based on this information, our instructional strategies are revised to ensure we are meeting the needs of our students.

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	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	38	29	35	14	16	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	7	0	2	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	3	2	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	22	21	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	18	20	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	2	6	11	11	0	0	0	31

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	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	2	47	32	36	31	21	0	0	0	169
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	1	1	1	11	11	6	0	0	0	31

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	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	2	47	32	36	31	21	0	0	0	169
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	1	11	11	6	0	0	0	31

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	43	54	53	49	55	56	44		
ELA Learning Gains				57			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			38		
Math Achievement*	53	61	59	59	51	50	45		
Math Learning Gains				63			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			14		
Science Achievement*	45	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	83	64	59	56			62		

* 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	272
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	439
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	20	Yes	4	1
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	62			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	50			

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	38	Yes	3	
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	50			

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	38	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	51			

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	43			53			45					83
SWD	18			23			9				4	
ELL	39			61							4	83
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			31			29				4	
HSP	44			58							4	83
MUL	50			50							2	
PAC												
WHT	50			63			52				5	88
FRL	38			49			39				5	81

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	49	57	55	59	63	53	47					56
SWD	18	43	58	40	55	42	13					
ELL	36	65		64	71		42					56
AMI												
ASN												

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	37	55	55	43	67	64	43					
HSP	38	60		50	57		50					43
MUL	33			42								
PAC												
WHT	59	54	40	69	63	50	51					67
FRL	39	51	50	51	63	50	44					56

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	44	44	38	45	40	14	44					62
SWD	30	36	45	31	23		20					
ELL	37	42		37	17		17					62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	50		37	32		29					
HSP	34	36		34	40		25					57
MUL	38			38								
PAC												
WHT	50	42	23	50	42		54					64
FRL	38	40	38	38	37	13	42					45

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	35%	57%	-22%	54%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	58%	-7%	58%	-7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	53%	-10%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	58%	62%	-4%	59%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	66%	-7%	61%	-2%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	61%	-12%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	60%	-14%	51%	-5%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

ELA- 5th grade cohort demonstrated the lowest in proficiency.

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

ELA demonstrated the greatest decline. Students entering their grade level significantly behind.

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.

ELA, Specifically the 5th grade cohort. Students entering grade level significantly below, lack of foundational understanding and exposure.

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

Math
 MTSS coach with emphasis on Math, Incentives

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

Attendance

Students failing ELA and or scored a Level 1

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

Attendance, ELA and Science proficiency.

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 ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the 2023 FAST ELA assessment, our current level of proficiency is 44%. We expect our performance level to be 65% by June 2024 as measured by the FAST PM 3 Assessment in June 2024

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall proficiency will increase to 65% by June 2024 as measured by the FAST PM 3 Assessment in June 2024.

Grade 3 proficiency will increase to *70% as measured by PM3 FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring, walk through feedback and data collection will be utilized to monitor the desired outcome.

Analyze new assessment data throughout the year to adjust instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Lightfoot (lightfoota@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Explicit and systematic instruction
Scaffolded instruction
Corrective feedback
Differentiated instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To improve our current level of performance as measured by the FAST Assessment System.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

Person Responsible: Amy Lightfoot (lightfoota@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

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

Person Responsible: Amy Lightfoot (lightfoota@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

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

Person Responsible: Amy Lightfoot (lightfoota@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

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

Person Responsible: Amy Lightfoot (lightfoota@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our current level of proficiency is 50% as evidenced by the 2023 FAST Math Assessment. We expect our performance level to be at 65% by June 2024 as measured by the FAST PM 3 Math Assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of students achieving math proficiency will increase from 50% to 65% as measured by the FAST PM 3 Assessment by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring data, walk through feedback and data collection will be utilized to monitor the desired outcome.

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.)

Establish mathematical goals to focus learning. To improve our current level of performance as measured by the FAST Math Assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Shifting from simply stating a standard to communicating learning expectations ensures that goals are appropriate, challenging, and attainable. When goals are specific, revisited throughout the lesson and connect to other mathematics, they become clearer to students. Effective teaching of mathematics establishes clear goals for the mathematics students are learning, situates goals within learning progressions, and uses the goals to inform instructional decisions. Effective Mathematics Teaching Practices (Principles to Actions, NCTM 2014

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers and administrators engage in Collaborative Planning (during or after school) utilizing the Best Instructional Guide to Mathematics (B1G-M) to support Implementation of the B.E.S.T. Standards and other instructional initiatives to analyze the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: June 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our current level of proficiency is 46% as evidenced by 2023 Science NGSSS Assessment. We expect our performance to be at 60% by June 2024 as measured by the SSA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all students achieving science proficiency will increase from 46% to 60% as measured by the SSA in 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring data, walk through feedback and data collection will be utilized to monitor the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica McMahon (mcmahonjes@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.)

Deepen the understanding of the Florida's State Academic Standards for Science (FSASS – previously named NGSSS) as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When focusing on Teacher Clarity, it is important for teachers to have clear intentions and success criteria in mind when presenting science content. Teachers also need to be able to provide effective feedback on and for learning. To do this, there needs to be a clear understanding of the learning goals that are aligned to the standards. Understanding the depth and breadth of the standards will support this work.

Prior Ability: Activating and integrating prior knowledge is one of the most powerful teaching strategies. It is important to slow down, ask our students what they already know about the matter, and make important connections to what is to come. Understanding the scope and sequence of the science standards will provide teachers a larger picture of learning - past, present, and future.

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.

During collaborative planning that occurs within school hours or after-school planning sessions, synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and content limits to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

Person Responsible: Jessica McMahon (mcmahonjes@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

During collaborative planning that occurs within school hours or after-school planning sessions, engage in standards articulation to gain a deeper understanding of prior knowledge and future learning to support students' holistic understanding of the Big Ideas in science.

Person Responsible: Jessica McMahon (mcmahonjes@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

Ensure professional development is content-focused, teacher and student-focused, instructionally relevant, and actionable.

Person Responsible: Jessica McMahon (mcmahonjes@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

Teachers and administrators engage in the just-in-time training they need to support implementation of the curriculum and other instructional initiatives already underway.

Person Responsible: Jessica McMahon (mcmahonjes@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

At the end of the 2022/2023 school year, our risk ratio for Black/African American students office discipline referrals (ODR) was 3.38 as measured by the Early Warning Systems in the PBIS Dashboard. The gap is occurring because of lack of consistency in the implementation of Tier I PBIS. Through the continued implementation and monitoring of our school-wide Tier I PBIS and Restorative Practices. The School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) will review monthly school-wide implementation findings for staff implementation of Tier I PBIS and Restorative Practices.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the end of the 2023/2024 school year our risk ratio for Black/African American students for office discipline referrals (ODR) will be reduced from 3.38 to 1.69 or below as measured by the Early Warning Systems in the PBIS Dashboard.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring, walk through feedback and data collection will be utilized to monitor the desired outcome.

Analyze call log, incident report, and office discipline referral data to adjust Tier I PBIS Implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica McMahon (mcmahonjes@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 use Tier I PBIS/ Restorative Practices and approaches to create conditions for success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Ensuring the inclusion of a nurturing environment that attends to the SEL needs of all stakeholders is integral to the learning environment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Provide training on school-wide Tier I PBIS/Restorative Practices implementation. Monitor and support staff for implementation with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Jessica McMahon (mcmahonjes@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

SBLT will review and monitor student and teacher data on a monthly basis to identify trends and next steps.

Person Responsible: Jessica McMahon (mcmahonjes@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

Provide opportunities to share data with staff and collect faculty input monthly.

Provide opportunities to collect student input bi-monthly.

Person Responsible: Jessica McMahon (mcmahonjes@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

Implement AVID CRT strategies to increase engagement of diverse learners. Encourage continued implementation morning meetings and community building circles promote a positive school/classroom climate by fostering learning environments that are safe.

Person Responsible: Jessica McMahon (mcmahonjes@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The goal is to eliminate the academic gap between Black students and their non-Black peers. Our current level of performance, based on 2022-2023 FAST ELA and Math data-assessment, is 29% in ELA and 31% in math. We expect our performance level to be at 60% by June 2024 as measured by the FAST Assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To increase proficiency in ELA and Math for African American students.
Our ELA performance will increase from 29% to 60% proficient.
Our Math performance will increase from 31% to 65% proficient.

Monitoring:

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

Observations, walkthrough, and analysis of trend data will be used to monitor the progress of Black students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica McMahon (mcmahonjes@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.)

- *Implement highly engaging strategies that reach a diverse group of learners, such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, and monitoring with feedback.
- *Ensure staff has access to real-time data specific to black students in order to have effective data chats and targeted support for improved learning.
- *Ensure black students are participating in extended learning.
- *Implement universal screening for gifted identification to expand the number of black students served within the talent development groups or identified as gifted learners.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To improve proficiency in ELA and Math

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Provide targeted professional development and additional coaching to teachers on implementing highly engaging strategies to increase engagement in rigorous instruction and increase the percent of proficient students.

Person Responsible: Jessica McMahon (mcmahonjes@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

Support teachers in purposeful planning that addresses highly engaging instruction and materials. Continue to improve the RP process, implement circles across campus and use of affective language.

Person Responsible: Jessica McMahon (mcmahonjes@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

Designate intentional time for teachers to do observations in other classrooms (specifically our model classroom) to observe highly engaging practices that support a diverse group of learners.

Person Responsible: Jessica Hill (hilljess@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

#6. 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.

Our current level of proficiency for our SWD is 24% proficiency in math and 12% proficiency in ELA as measured by the 2023 FAST assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To increase proficiency in Math and ELA for our students with disabilities.

Math will increase from 24% to 65%

ELA will increase from 12% to 60%

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring data, walkthrough feedback and data collection will be utilized to monitor the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Hill (hilljess@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.)

Create a schedule that maximizes ESE student participation in the LRE. Instruct students with disabilities in foundation skills necessary to engage in rigorous grade level content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To increase the proficiency of our ESE students in ELA and Math utilizing standards-based curriculum and engage all students in rigorous tasks.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Provide embedded PD and coaching supports centered around utilizing data to drive instruction.

Person Responsible: Jessica Hill (hilljess@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

Implement a process for placing students of ESE in master schedule first in order to optimize service delivery and focus on a clustering process to meet student needs.

Person Responsible: Jessica McMahon (mcmahonjes@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023

Provide time for gen ed and ESE staff to collaborate and co-plan on developing SDI that meets the needs of students.

Person Responsible: Jessica Hill (hilljess@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

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.

To increase the ELA and Math performance of our multi racial students as measured by the FAST Assessment by June 2024

Measurable Outcome:

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

To increase overall proficiency for our multiracial students to 65% in ELA and 65% in Math as measured by PM3 FAST Assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Observations, walkthrough, and analysis of trend data will be used to monitor the progress of multiracial students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Hill (hilljess@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.)

Implement highly engaging strategies that reach a diverse group of learners, such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction and monitoring with feedback.

Ensure staff has access to real-time data specific to multiracial students in order to have effective data chats and targeted support for improved learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To eliminate the gap between multiracial student and non-multiracial students

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Provide targeted professional development and additional coaching to teachers on implementing highly engaging strategies to increase engagement in rigorous instruction and increase the percent of proficient students.

Person Responsible: Jessica Hill (hilljess@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

Designate intentional time for teachers to do observations in other classrooms (specifically our model classroom) to observe highly engaging practices that support a diverse group of learners.

Person Responsible: Jessica Hill (hilljess@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

Conduct walkthroughs with focus on implementation of highly engaging strategies that reach a diverse group of learners.

Person Responsible: Jessica Hill (hilljess@pcsb.org)

By When: June 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).

The school-based leadership team meets to review our school wide goals and resources available to support the goals. Available funding is allocated to support the instructional needs of our teachers and students. Resources are implemented based on need and student outcomes.

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 support, 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 support, 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

50% or more of our K-2 students will demonstrate proficiency on the FAST ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

50% or more of our 3-5 students will demonstrate proficiency on the FAST ELA 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.

Frequent formative assessment data to be reviewed in weekly PLCs with instructional planning and strategies developed during collaborative planning time. Coaching cycles will be implemented with consistent and ongoing feedback to improve instruction and student outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hill, Jessica, hilljess@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?

Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies.

Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency and

comprehension.

Provide print rich, explicit, systematic and scaffolded instruction.

Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words.

Reinforce the effectiveness of instruction in alphabetics, fluency and vocabulary.

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 (alphabetics), 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
-------------	-----------------------------------

? 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

? 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.

? 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.

Hill, Jessica,
hilljess@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 disseminated to all stakeholders through our family events- Open House, Meet the Teacher, PTA and SAC meetings. Additionally, our SIP is shared via our school newsletter and school information center located in our front office.

<https://www.pcsb.org/domain/218>

<https://www.pcsb.org/sawgrass-es>

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))

<https://www.pcsb.org/sawgrass-es>

Sawgrass Lake plans to build positive relationships with all families through our family engagement events. Each event is designed to support a specific need depending on the timing of the event- Literacy, Kindergarten Readiness, STEM, Test prep.

Additionally, each teacher conducts parent teacher conferences, to ensure parents are informed of their child's progress and how to help at home.

See Parent Family Engagement Plan for specific details on 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)

The school intends on ensuring that all academic time is accounted for by monitoring transitions and reducing time spent, ensure our master schedule is aligned to support the needs of all students and maximize instruction through an enriched and accelerated curriculum.

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