Cypress Woods Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Cypress Woods Elementary School

4900 CYPRESS WOODS BLVD, Palm Harbor, FL 34685

http://www.cypress-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.

Teach It! Learn It! Live It!

Provide the school's vision statement.

To achieve Cypress Woods Elementary's vision, we will prepare our students to become independent learners with the desires, skills, and abilities necessary for lifelong learning. This will require creating a learning environment which is centered around students, directed by teachers, and supported by home and community.

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
Stevens, Christopher	Principal	Creates a safe environment while monitoring the School Improvement Plan and school-wide data, providing instructional leadership and support, and developing and maintaining a positive school climate that meets the needs of all learners.
Drainville, Kristin	Assistant Principal	Assists in monitoring School Improvement Plan, instructional leadership and support, developing and maintaining a positive and safe school climate, and monitoring school wide data.

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 was gathered through staff, parent and student surveys. All staff members were given the opportunity to serve on the SIP development team given their interest in subjects and areas of expertise.

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

SIP will be monitored by the monthly SIP teams, reviewing student data and action steps.

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	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	27%
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) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) 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	1	18	13	7	12	17	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	14	10	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	6	7	0	0	0	14
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	1	4	7	0	0	0	12

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	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) 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	21	10	14	14	8	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	1	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	14
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	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	1	0	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	21	10	14	14	8	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	1	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	14
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	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	1	0	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*	75	54	53	83	55	56	83		
ELA Learning Gains				72			73		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			72		
Math Achievement*	85	61	59	87	51	50	86		
Math Learning Gains				79			75		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				82			63		
Science Achievement*	86	62	54	86	62	59	87		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	91	64	59	77			64		

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	81
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	630
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	58			
ELL	73			
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK				
HSP	81			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	70			

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	63			
ELL	71			
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK				
HSP	81			

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	81			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	67			

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	75			85			86					91
SWD	57			53			61				4	
ELL	47			82							3	91
AMI												
ASN	73			64							2	
BLK												
HSP	76			93			90				4	
MUL	57			81							2	
PAC												
WHT	78			87			89				4	
FRL	65			73			80				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	83	72	64	87	79	82	86					77
SWD	50	57	39	66	83	88	58					
ELL	64			71								77
AMI												
ASN	70			70								

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												
HSP	76	72		83	83	90	82					
MUL	81			81								
PAC												
WHT	85	71	63	89	79	82	86					
FRL	67	73	68	73	73	59	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
All Students	83	73	72	86	75	63	87					64
SWD	49	69		60	62		54					
ELL	55			58								64
AMI												
ASN	70			80								
BLK	50			60								
HSP	82	69		77	69		86					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	86	73	76	89	77	67	90					64
FRL	67	67		82	67		73					55

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	77%	57%	20%	54%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	58%	27%	58%	27%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	66%	53%	13%	50%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	85%	62%	23%	59%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	90%	66%	24%	61%	29%
05	2023 - Spring	88%	61%	27%	55%	33%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	85%	60%	25%	51%	34%

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 proficiency for the 2022-23 school year was 78%, which was a decrease of 5% from the previous year. Math proficiency was 88% and Science proficiency was 86%. The contributing factors were the completion of a new state assessment, and our 3rd grade proficiency was below 70% as a grade level.

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

ELA proficiency was the only decline from the previous school year. ELA proficiency scores decreased by 5%. Math proficiency increased 1% and Science proficiency did not change. 3rd grade proficiency in ELA was below 70%, while 4th grade was 78% and 5th grade was 86% proficient.

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.

Math proficiency as a school was 21 points higher than the state average. Highlighted gaps: 5th grade was 27 points higher than the state average and 4th grade was 24 points higher than the state average.

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

The data that showed the most improvement was Math proficiency as it was up to 88% from the previous school year at 87%. Overall math gains went up 1%. The school collaborated with District personnel as this was the first year of the new FAST assessment. The school completed PLCs and data chats on student data from PM1 and PM2.

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

Data from EWS, showed an increase for students whose attendance was below 90 percent. There was also an increase in Level 1's from PM3 of FAST.

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

1. Deepening understanding of the Florida's B.E.S.T. ELA standards and benchmarks as a non-negotiable for improving outcomes for whole group and small group instruction.
2. Intentionally plan and deliver lessons that meet the needs of Gifted & Talented learners and Students with Disabilities by differentiating lessons regularly.
3. Decrease the students receiving referrals.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

As teachers become more skilled in understanding critical content, they will see remarkable changes in students' abilities to process and understand new content because they are able to identify which content is critical and understand how learned content scaffolds in complexity. A classroom of scholars identifies critical content within standards, but also studies, recognizes, and celebrates as knowledge grows increasingly more sophisticated.

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

83% proficiency for ELA achievement on the 2024 FAST by deepening understanding of the Florida's B.E.S.T. ELA standards and benchmarks as a non-negotiable for improving outcomes for whole group and small group instruction. 93% proficiency for Math achievement by deepen understanding of the Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards for Mathematics as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes. 90% proficiency for science achievement on the 2024 FAST by deepen the understanding of the Florida's State Academic Standards for Science (FSASS – previously named NGSSS) as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

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

Unit assessments, Formal and informal teacher assessments, data from PM 1 and cycle 2, module assessments, monthly ISIP data, progress monitoring, benchmark assessments, Dreambox and science unit assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Stevens (stevensch@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 Led Small group instruction, identifying critical content (Marzano and Toth), teacher clarity (Hattie, Fisher, Frye)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers can use data to select standard based critical content to support in small group instruction to best meet the needs of individual 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 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Continue to deepen understanding of the vertical progression and standards design in order to understand what students are expected to master.

Person Responsible: Christopher Stevens (stevensch@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout entire school year

Use state and district resources (such as the BEST ELA Standards and PCS Gold Document) to synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

Person Responsible: Christopher Stevens (stevensch@pcsb.org)

By When: Beginning in August and utilizing throughout the year

Provide regular structures for planning/PLCs where teachers regularly engage in data/student work analysis as well as intellectual prep and lesson rehearsal including planning for scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible: Christopher Stevens (stevensch@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the school year

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: Christopher Stevens (stevensch@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the school year

Employ instructional practices that result in students doing the work within lessons.

Person Responsible: Christopher Stevens (stevensch@pcsb.org)

By When: Beginning in August and then monitored throughout the school year.

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. 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: Christopher Stevens (stevensch@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the school year

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: Christopher Stevens (stevensch@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the school year

#2. 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.

As evidenced by 2023 FAST, gifted learners demonstrating a level 4 or 5 in ELA was 86% and 94% in Math. Students with disabilities demonstrating proficiency was 55% in ELA and 62% in math. We believe with this data indicates a need for intentionally planned differentiation which would ultimately result in improved achievement.

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

By June 2024, achievement for gifted students in levels 4 and 5, as measured through FAST, will increase in ELA from 85% to 90% and in math from 94% to 96%. Additionally, students with disabilities achieving proficiency will increase in ELA from 55% to 70% and in math from 62% to 75% as evidenced by FAST.

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

The area of focus will be monitored by:
-Data using PLCs and Data Chats.
-Administrative walkthroughs and feedback conferences
-Grade level data reviews

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Stevens (stevensch@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.)

To address our focus area, educators will intentionally plan and deliver lessons that meet the needs of Gifted & Talented learners and Students with Disabilities by differentiating lessons regularly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Each student in a classroom is a unique individual with varied learning needs. When teachers intentionally plan for differentiation, they are able to engage and reach all learners ultimately resulting in increased achievement.

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.

In order to support these strategies our school will:
*cluster groups of gifted and talented students in general education classes so that the process of engaging students in complex.
*Schedule Gifted Learners with teachers who have earned their gifted micro-credential.

*Encourage teachers to engage in professional development on differentiation for Gifted Learners (on site and district wide)
*Encourage teachers to engage in professional development on differentiation for Students with Disabilities (on site and district wide)
*Embed opportunities for Universal Design (UDL) in lessons
*Seek and provide support from district instructional staff developers in the areas of differentiation

Person Responsible: Christopher Stevens (stevensch@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2024

#3. 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.

Our current discipline data includes 26 total referrals (16 students), and 101 Family Communication Forms. We expect the number of referrals to decrease by May 2024. In the past two years we have seen a need to intentionally teach students strategies for social and emotional development in the classroom, created and implemented a positive intervention system. This involves teaching and modeling social and emotional skills, providing opportunities for students to practice and hone those skills, and giving students an opportunity to apply these skills in various situations.

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 24% as measured by discipline data in Focus by May 2024.

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

Goal will be monitored by:
- Administration/student services during visits to classrooms during Harmony lessons
- SBLT reviewing discipline and PBIS data monthly
- PLC minutes on SEL and PBIS lessons used in grade levels
- Participation in school-wide PD related to PBIS/SEL

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristin Drainville (drainvillek@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.)

If we focus on intentional planning of SEL strategies in our daily classroom routines, we will not only provide students a foundation for safe and positive learning, but also and enhances their ability to succeed in school, academically and behaviorally. Teaching SEL strategies also establishes and maintains positive relationships with all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that SEL not only improves achievement by an average of 11percentile points, but it also increases prosocial behaviors (such as kindness, sharing, and empathy), improves student attitudes toward school, and reduces depression and stress among students. Effective social and emotional learning programming involves coordinated classroom, schoolwide, family, and community practices that help students develop self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationships, and responsible decision making.

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.

Goal will be monitored by:
- Classroom teachers will continue the use of Harmony lessons (Meet Up and/or Buddy Up) at least 3 times a week
-All K-5 classrooms participate in guidance lessons 3-4 times a year. Lesson topics will be collaboratively decided between teacher and school counselor
-All classrooms expected to follow school wide PBIS plan and align classroom management plan to Guidelines for Success (SOAR)
-Classroom Management Plans will focus on positive reinforcement
-Students set their own positive behavior goal
-Implement student led conference to allow students to share academic goals and progress with family members

Person Responsible: Kristin Drainville (drainvillek@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.

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

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

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes