

Pinellas County Schools

Pasadena Fundamental 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	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	27
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pasadena Fundamental Elementary School

95 72ND ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33710

<http://www.pasadena-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.

100% Student Success

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pasadena Fundamental School is a school of choice that creates a safe, fundamental learning environment where faculty, staff, parents, and community work in partnership to foster highest student achievement.

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
Moody, Donita	Principal	<p>The Principal is the instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes, through the hiring, development, support, supervision and retention of high-quality instructional and support staff. As the school leader, the Principal creates a culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families through collaboration and distributive leadership. In alignment with the Florida Principal Standards, the Principal leads the school team to increased school and student outcomes by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing the operational, safety, and policy responsibilities of a school-building leader.</p>
Yeomans, Charlotte	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assists stakeholders in the development of shared vision, mission and goals • Advocates best practices for the classroom • Supports the School Improvement Plan (SIP) for continual improvement in student achievement • Models a focus on highest student achievement • Assists teachers in aligning classroom plans to the School Improvement Plan (SIP), district and state requirements • Assists in the development and communication of long and short term school plans and goals related to highest student achievement • Allocates time and resources consistent with the goals and objectives of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) • Communicates concerns and needs of teachers, parents, students, and district personnel to school administrators • Assists with the collection and analysis of input from staff, parents, and students for the development of improvement strategies • Maintains and monitors an information system that supports the student achievement goals. • Coordinates assessments at the school site • Provides staff and other stakeholders with timely access to information, materials, and processes to improve student performance • Assists teachers in analyzing and using relevant data to systematically review or improve school actions, plans, processes, and systems • Uses comparison and benchmarking data in the analysis of academic performance • Stays current on District and school issues, trends, and operations • Uses information to support/monitor school/district goals • Promotes teacher access to professional development and information needed for highest student achievement • Supports a school-wide environment conducive to the wellbeing and growth of all instructional staff

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognizes staff successes • Deals professionally and appropriately with all staff • Maintains professional development data to promote student achievement • Facilitates professional development of teachers by modeling quality processes and best practices • Assists teachers in analyzing, monitoring, and communicating data results used in Response to Instruction/Intervention (RTI) process
Lang, Rose	Teacher, K-12	<p>This is an instructional position with responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of pupils in a group or class within an elementary school.</p> <p>DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaches skills, concepts and social competencies to elementary school pupils. • Plans a program for individualized and group instruction based on identified long-range goals and specific objectives. • Uses a variety of techniques and materials to instruct and motivate students. • Maintains records appropriate to a diagnostic/prescriptive approach. • Uses appropriate classroom management techniques. • Confers with the pupil, his/her parents, the principal and/or supportive personnel regarding the pupil's academic and social development. • Maintains required records. • Applies knowledge of child growth and development. • Evaluates student achievements. • Performs other related duties as required.
Leonard, Brianne	Teacher, K-12	<p>DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaches skills, concepts and social competencies to elementary school pupils. • Plans a program for individualized and group instruction based on identified long-range goals and specific objectives. • Uses a variety of techniques and materials to instruct and motivate students. • Maintains records appropriate to a diagnostic/prescriptive approach. • Uses appropriate classroom management techniques. • Confers with the pupil, his/her parents, the principal and/or supportive personnel regarding the pupil's academic and social development. • Maintains required records. • Applies knowledge of child growth and development. • Evaluates student achievements. • Performs other related duties as required.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Badal, Dena	Teacher, K-12	<p>DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaches skills, concepts and social competencies to elementary school pupils. • Plans a program for individualized and group instruction based on identified long-range goals and specific objectives. • Uses a variety of techniques and materials to instruct and motivate students. • Maintains records appropriate to a diagnostic/prescriptive approach. • Uses appropriate classroom management techniques. • Confers with the pupil, his/her parents, the principal and/or supportive personnel regarding the pupil's academic and social development. • Maintains required records. • Applies knowledge of child growth and development. • Evaluates student achievements. • Performs other related duties as required.

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.

In addition to soliciting input from the School Advisory Council, staff stakeholders provide input for SIP via PLC, staff meetings and surveys. Student stakeholders provided input for SIP via SAFE schools, and student leadership team.

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))

- Conduct walk-throughs and observations (Aligned to PCS Teaching and Learning Expectations, Marzano Focused Evaluation Model, Tier 1 PBIS Walkthrough Expectations, Instructional Support Model Expectations)-Collect and review data on implementation of the curriculum (Administration collects data and provides feedback. Administrator's Quick Glance is used to ensure that students are taught/learning the standards.
- Facilitate PLCs (Review of data including student work samples to ensure differentiation)
- Review Coaching Feedback (Ensure strategies that teachers learn are being implemented to fidelity.)
- Review Assessment Data (Review formative and summative data to ensure that student needs are met and make adjustments as needed.)

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	31%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) 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: A 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	0	3	1	5	5	2	0	0	0	16	
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	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	6	3	0	0	0	10	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	

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	3	1	5	5	2	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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	6	10	10	11	7	0	0	0	44	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	6	10	10	11	7	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
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*	74	54	53	73	55	56	74		
ELA Learning Gains				72			72		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			64		
Math Achievement*	79	61	59	82	51	50	81		
Math Learning Gains				64			72		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			64		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	83	62	54	75	62	59	78		
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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	312
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
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	54			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	62			
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	73			

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	56			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	68			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	63			

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	74			79			83					
SWD	50			58							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	61			67							3	
MUL	83			83							2	
PAC												
WHT	76			81			84				4	
FRL	71			74			73				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	73	72	54	82	64	52	75					
SWD	50	53		68	53							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	63	59		75	71		73					
MUL	67	71		90	86							
PAC												
WHT	78	75	71	85	64	50	79					
FRL	64	69	65	69	65	45	63					

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	74	72	64	81	72	64	78					
SWD	58			63								
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	45			82								
HSP	66	41		69	65		56					
MUL	58			83								
PAC												
WHT	78	80	83	85	78	75	90					
FRL	56	68		67	63	70	60					

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	76%	57%	19%	54%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	58%	17%	58%	17%
03	2023 - Spring	75%	53%	22%	50%	25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	81%	62%	19%	59%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	88%	66%	22%	61%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	77%	61%	16%	55%	22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	83%	60%	23%	51%	32%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Reading. Overall, the percentage was 75% in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades.

There is a need for additional training and planning to support the core curriculum to meet the individual needs of learners (differentiated instruction). i.e.: ESE, Gifted, ED

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

3rd grade Math proficiency was 86% in 2022 and decreased to 80% in 2023. The following strategies could be implemented to positively impact future data:

- Implement tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving.
- Pose purposeful questions.
- Facilitate meaningful mathematics discourse.

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.

Pasadena exceeded state averages.

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

Our proficiency in science from 2022 was 74%. We improved to 83% proficiency in 2023.

Some new action steps we took were as follows:

Science vocabulary words with definitions were read daily on the morning news.

Science lab was used with fidelity along with science curriculum materials.

Formative assessments were used to monitor learning and to assist teachers in making informed decisions.

Summative assessments were used to measure the level of understanding to which students achieved the learning goals.

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

Absent 10% more days

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

- 1.) 3rd grade math
- 2.) Reading in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades
- 3.) Data analysis provided to help teachers with deliberate instruction.

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.

Standards based data from FAST and common assessments collected from previous years showed students are stagnant as far as proficiency in ELA, with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade appropriate standards.

Our goal is to ensure whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block in both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 10% from 75% to 85%, as measured by state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

The ELA Focus will be monitored via observations and walkthroughs with feedback, analysis of student data including authentic work samples, anecdotal records, student observations, and PLC minutes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Donita Moody (moodyd@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.)

Teachers will differentiate in four classroom elements. Those elements are content, process, products and learning environment. Teachers will do this by monitoring student learning and check for understanding using formal deliberate methods to determine students' progression towards standard mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The problem/gap is occurring due to the limited knowledge of the FAST ELA Standards. If fidelity of implementation of research-based strategies would occur, the problem would be reduced.

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

Person Responsible: Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, purposeful discussions, and writing with feedback ensuring ample time is given to students to read and write appropriate grade level text (while applying foundational skills) with high quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback to improve work.

Person Responsible: Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Utilize the ELA walkthrough tool and other ELA tools to provide weekly feedback to individual ELA teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff.

Person Responsible: Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Employ instructional practices that result in students doing the work of the lesson (higher order questioning, quick demonstration followed by practice, limiting teacher talk, high quality feedback, and opportunities to use that feedback).

Person Responsible: Donita Moody (moodyd@pcsb.org)

By When: May 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.

Standards based data from FAST and common assessments collected from previous years showed students lack consistency in tasks aligned to grade appropriate standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency in Math will increase 10% from 81% to 91%, as measured by PM3 state assessment data.

Monitoring:

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

Observations and walkthroughs with feedback, analysis of student data including authentic work samples, anecdotal records, student observations and PLC minutes. Use of the walkthrough tool that aligns to the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards (MTRS). All of the BEST content standards will be taught through the lens of the MTRS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charlotte Yeomans (yeomansc@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.)

Establish mathematical goals to focus learning. When goals are specific and connected to prior content learned, they are clearer to students which allows for informed instruction that leads to higher proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The problem/gap is accruing due to limited knowledge of the BEST math standards. If fidelity of implementation of researched based strategies would occur, the problem would be reduced.

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 (Big M) to support implementation of the BEST 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: Charlotte Yeomans (yeomansc@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Teachers and Administrator implement and facilitate a goal setting environment where students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals, monitor academic progress throughout the year, revise goals based on data, and celebrate success.

Person Responsible: Charlotte Yeomans (yeomansc@pcsb.org)

By When: May 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.

Deepen the understanding of the Florida's State Academic Standards for Science (FSASS - previously named NGSSS) as a nonnegotiable for improving student outcomes. Because there are new Science standards along with a new state assessment, our teachers and students need to be prepared for the transition to the new standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency in Science will increase 10% from 83% to 93% as measured by FSASS.

Monitoring:

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

Assessment of student learning will be ongoing. Implementation of formal and informal assessment strategies will identify conceptual understanding and student misconceptions. Formative assessments will be used to monitor student learning to assist teachers in making informed decisions on teaching practices. Summative assessments will be used to measure the level of understanding to which students have achieved the learning goal/goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charlotte Yeomans (yeomansc@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.)

Utilize Science curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The problem may occur due to lack of deep understanding of the standards.

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

Person Responsible: Charlotte Yeomans (yeomansc@pcsb.org)

By When: 5/2024

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: Charlotte Yeomans (yeomansc@pcsb.org)

By When: 5/2024

#4. 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.

Pasadena Fundamental Elementary School is a District Application School. Membership in fundamental schools is a privilege enjoyed by interested and qualified Pinellas County students. Therefore, students are expected to exhibit exemplary achievement and conduct while in membership in these programs. The fundamental school provides for those students who work best where expectations are clearly defined. A strong emphasis is placed on the requirement that stakeholders at home and school work together to promote successful learning.

Participation by parents/guardians is also a requirement. A collaborative spirit exists within a framework of mutual respect, cooperation and regard for the rights and property of others, and is viewed as an integral part of the school environment. Proficiency for implementation of Tier 1 PBIS expectations is 90%.

Out of School Suspensions: 2

Office Referrals: 3

Detentions: 114

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency for implementation of Tier 1 PBIS expectations will increase from 90% to 95%.

Monitoring:

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

School leaders will facilitate Tier 1 PBIS walkthroughs and provide specific feedback each semester.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rose Lang (langr@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.)

PBIS expectations will be explicitly taught through classroom discussions and modeling. Review student and teacher academic and behavior data on a regular basis for trends and next steps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students should have opportunities to analyze and apply their learning through discussion. Data should be used to determine gaps in implementation or understanding.

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 site-based SEL (social emotional learning) professional development
- Explicit instruction of SEL (social emotional learning) skills are given multiple times through the year as well as curricula that embeds these skills in content instruction.
- Provides lesson plans to teach expected social behaviors directly to all students in all classrooms.
- Circles are used to teach and reteach school-wide expectations including discussion and activities around examples and non-examples.
- Restorative Practice presentations and resources covering various social emotional behaviors and discussion topics following the PCS character education initiative are provided.
- Increased use of community building circles that develop relationships to prevent problem behaviors.
- Implementation of Pasadena PRIDE Awards system for positive behavior.
- Implementation of the Defend A Friend Anti-Bullying Program K-5.

Person Responsible: Rose Lang (langr@pcsb.org)

By When: May 24, 2024

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**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.

Implement a Talent Program that provides access to gifted pedagogy to students showing gifted characteristics to ensure academic success and increase gifted identification rates.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of Talented students scoring a Level 4 or 5 in ELA will increase from 81% to 91% and in MATH will increase from 93% to 100%, as measured by PM3 state assessment data.

Monitoring:

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

Analyze testing data and trends for learners in the Talent Program.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rose Lang (langr@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Monitor academic growth of all learners with regards to B.E.S.T. Standards and action plan for scaffolded support or enrichment/extension as needed to ensure continuous engagement and academic growth of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategy will allow for the unique needs of each student to be planned for and addressed.

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.

Monitor the Talent Program and provide support as needed.

Person Responsible: Rose Lang (langr@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Celebrate the successes of the Talent Program

Person Responsible: Rose Lang (langr@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Plan intentionally for differentiation using both formative testing and pre-test data to appropriately differentiate with leveled or tiered questions, objectives or assignments.

Person Responsible: Rose Lang (langr@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.