

Pinellas County Schools

Oldsmar Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Oldsmar Elementary School

302 DARTMOUTH AVE W, Oldsmar, FL 34677

<http://www.oldsmar-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 Oldsmar Elementary is to provide a safe learning environment, while educating and inspiring each student to reach their maximum potential and become lifelong learners and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will foster 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
Logan, Greg	Principal	
Williams, Brandi	Assistant Principal	
Manning, Deborah	School Counselor	
Willett, Janelle	Psychologist	

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.

Input for the SIP is based on stakeholder survey in addition to school data. Upon completion, School Advisory Council reviews and approves.

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 by reviewing action items and gauging effectiveness based on student data, observational walkthroughs and PLC conversations. The key ideas will be at the forefront of staff meetings and PLC discussions.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	55%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	17	22	19	11	11	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	6	19	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	11	12	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	4	12	0	0	0	16

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	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	18	13	14	16	18	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	5	7	18	20	42	0	0	0	92
Course failure in Math	0	5	7	18	20	42	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
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	2	9	8	13	13	31	0	0	0	76

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	3	6	2	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	18	13	14	16	18	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	5	7	18	20	42	0	0	0	92
Course failure in Math	0	5	7	18	20	42	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
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	2	9	8	13	13	31	0	0	0	76

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	3	6	2	0	0	0	0	16
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*	59	54	53	61	55	56	57		
ELA Learning Gains				55			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			19		
Math Achievement*	69	61	59	68	51	50	60		
Math Learning Gains				60			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			21		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	67	62	54	54	62	59	45		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	53	64	59	76			55		

* 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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	312
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
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	26	Yes	2	1
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	50			
HSP	58			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	60			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	55			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	53			

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	59			69			67					53
SWD	22			31			25				3	
ELL	47			60							3	53
AMI												
ASN	70			100							2	
BLK	52			48							2	
HSP	62			62			55				5	40
MUL	80			80							2	
PAC												
WHT	56			71			72				4	
FRL	55			63			51				5	62

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	61	55	49	68	60	41	54					76
SWD	31	45	50	42	55	36	20					
ELL	35	44		52	63		25					76
AMI												
ASN	77			92								
BLK	31	20		44	50							
HSP	52	58	47	55	54	50	45					82
MUL	77			69								
PAC												
WHT	66	57	55	74	60	24	60					
FRL	52	56	52	55	55	39	32					86

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	57	48	19	60	45	21	45					55
SWD	21	8	10	22	15		0					
ELL	38			50								55

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	47			29								
HSP	43	50		52	26		35					54
MUL	91			50								
PAC												
WHT	59	50	9	66	58		48					
FRL	45	38	17	49	37		43					56

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	59%	57%	2%	54%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	58%	1%	58%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	53%	9%	50%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	75%	62%	13%	59%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	66%	9%	61%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	61%	-1%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	60%	7%	51%	16%

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 showed the lowest performance at 60% which was a 1% decrease from the previous year. Contributing factors are lack of structured intervention processes in addition to BEST standards implementation.

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 the prior year by a decrease of 1%. Contributing factors are implementation of BEST standards in CORE instruction.

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.

Data components matched or were above state.

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

Science data showed the greatest increase from 54% to 67% +13. Contributing factors: Collaborative planning, increase in vocabulary/spiral review in extended learning programs, and purposefully data reflection with individual students.

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

Areas of concern: Students with 10% or more absence and Students with course failure in ELA or Math.

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

Highest priority will be instruction in ELA as well as interventions. In addition, Child Study Team will focus on decreasing the number of students with 10% or more absences.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to 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.

Cultivating a Supporting Environment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of students receiving referrals will decrease by 3%

Monitoring:

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

Through MTTs Behavior discussions and monthly behavior data review.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandi Williams (williamsbran@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.)

Engaging students, staff, and families in important decision-making processes. Creating consistent and predictable environments where expectations are explicit so that the whole school community knows how to be successful.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Involving all stakeholders in decision making processes builds ownership and fosters strong community culture.

Creating predictable environments with consistent expectations promotes success and routine.

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.

Increase family engagement events to support communication and understanding of PBIS and instructional strategies.

Students will engage in lessons on common area expectations-HOOT. All classrooms will follow school-wide expectations that align with PBIS plan.

Person Responsible: Brandi Williams (williamsbran@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

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

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

Our data shows continued growth needed with a current proficiency rate of 60% on the 2023 FAST.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By Spring of 2024, the overall percentage of students achieving 3 or above on the state assessment, will exceed 65% and Grade 3 proficiency will increase to *70% based on PM3 FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Area of Focus will be monitored through progress monitoring and walkthrough observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Greg Logan (logang@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Human resource will be maximized to increase rigorous, culturally relevant, standards-based instruction to students. By utilizing MTSS coach, interventionists, and specialists through collaborative and facilitated planning, teachers will assure the delivery of high quality, standards-based lessons to 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.

Teachers and administrators provide ALL students with consistent opportunities to engage in in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark.

Person Responsible: Greg Logan (logang@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Teachers and administrators employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to positive expectations for success; meaningful tasks related to student interests & cultural backgrounds; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.

Person Responsible: Greg Logan (logang@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Prioritize increasing volume of reading in grade level text, with discussion and feedback.

Person Responsible: Greg Logan (logang@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#3. 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 data shows continued growth needed with a current proficiency rate of 71% on the 2023 FAST.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By Spring of 2024, the percentage of students achieving 3 or above on the state assessment, will exceed 75%.

Monitoring:

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

Area of Focus will be monitored through progress monitoring and walkthrough observations.

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.

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 provide ALL students with consistent opportunities to engage in in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark.

Person Responsible: Brandi Williams (williamsbran@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Teachers and administrators employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to: positive expectations for success; meaningful tasks related to student interests & cultural backgrounds; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.

Person Responsible: Brandi Williams (williamsbran@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Assure students receive differentiated instruction and individualized feedback and support in math.

Person Responsible: Brandi Williams (williamsbran@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#4. 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.

Deepen the understanding of the Florida's State Academic Standards for Science (FSASS – previously named NGSSS) as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes. Our data shows continued growth needed with a current proficiency rate of 67% on the 2023 state assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By Spring of 2024, the percentage of students achieving 3 or above on the state assessment, will exceed 70%.

Monitoring:

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

Area of Focus will monitored through walkthrough observation, student data chats and progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Greg Logan (logang@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

- Teacher Clarity
- Prior Ability

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.
- 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.
- Teachers and administrators engage in the just-in-time training they need to support implementation of the curriculum and other instructional initiatives already underway.
- Ensure professional development is content-focused, teacher and student-focused, instructionally relevant, and actionable.

Person Responsible: Greg Logan (logang@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Teachers and administrators employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to: positive expectations for success; meaningful tasks related to student interests & cultural backgrounds; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.

Person Responsible: Greg Logan (logang@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).

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