

Pinellas County Schools

Highland Lakes 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Highland Lakes Elementary School

1230 HIGHLANDS BLVD, Palm Harbor, FL 34684

<http://www.highland-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.

Highland Lakes Elementary staff, parents, and the community will be leaders in teaching, learning, modeling, and preparing students for college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To reach 100% of each student's individualized social, emotional, physical, and academic goals.

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
Defant, Eliza	Principal	Instructional leader and co-facilitator
Durocher , Jyllene	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader
Barrett, Colby	Behavior Specialist	Behavior coach
Bembnowski, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader- 5th grade
Cooper, Cathi	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader- 3rd grade
Wightman, Mary	Teacher, ESE	Team Leader- EBD
Williamson, Margaret	Instructional Technology	Team leader- PCS Connects and Library/Media team leader
Mogyordy, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Team leader- KG
Metts, Veronica	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader- 4th grade
Newton , Sarah	Teacher, K-12	Team leader- 1st grade

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.

Stakeholder involvement and input was provided in May, 2023 in the following ways:

1. Who- Faculty and staff; When: Staff Meeting
2. Who- Parents, Community members: When: School Advisory Committee (SAC)
3. Who- Students: When- Lunch periods (students in grades 3 and 5)

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 School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be regularly monitored to ensure effective implementation and impact on student achievement in the following ways:

1. Team Leader Meetings- The school leaders will share school-wide data aligned to each goal area and/or specific instructional goals. Team leaders will provide input, progress updates, and/or action steps to improve or continue progress towards goals/action steps.
2. Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) Meetings- The school leaders will schedule monthly meetings with ELA champions, Library Media Technology specialist, and VE/ESE teacher leaders to share and plan professional development, coaching, support, and feedback to classroom teachers in the area of literacy.
3. Leadership data meetings/check-ins- The school leaders will meet regularly to monitor, reflect, and prioritize goals supported by on-going formative assessment data. In addition, school leaders will develop a Professional Learning Plan for each semester with teacher input to continue to enhance teacher pedagogy.
4. SAC meetings- The Principal will share and obtain parent and community feedback with SAC members on school goals and action steps throughout the school year.
5. Staff and Curriculum Meetings- The school leaders will focus on key SIP goals/actions steps that align to the SIP to ensure fidelity and monitoring of key action steps that support school-wide goals.

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	31%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	44%
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) 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	11	16	11	15	15	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	8	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	13	12	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	19	7	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	2	7	2	3	4	0	0	0	19

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	3	1	7	8	0	0	0	20

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	0	3	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	20	11	13	7	16	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	2	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	14	12	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	14	14	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	6	4	5	5	0	0	0	20

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	1	1	4	3	0	0	0	10

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	20	11	13	7	16	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	2	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	14	12	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	14	14	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	6	4	5	5	0	0	0	20

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	1	1	4	3	0	0	0	10

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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*	55	54	53	62	55	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				64			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			55		
Math Achievement*	59	61	59	64	51	50	68		
Math Learning Gains				65			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			48		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	62	62	54	67	62	59	68		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		64	59				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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	233
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	429
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	27	Yes	4	1
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	62			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	51			

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	3	
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK				
HSP	67			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	57			

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	55			59			62					
SWD	23			23			50				4	
ELL	50			70							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			25							2	
HSP	57			67			59				4	
MUL	53			61			40				3	
PAC												
WHT	54			57			67				4	
FRL	49			47			57				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	62	64	53	64	65	54	67					
SWD	29	46	39	40	45	38	44					
ELL	50			70								
AMI												
ASN	73			73								
BLK												
HSP	58	62		70	77		67					
MUL	47			53								
PAC												
WHT	66	63	52	64	63	55	73					
FRL	54	64	50	59	59	50	65					

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	66	67	55	68	71	48	68					55
SWD	18	50		46	33		28					
ELL	50			83								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	70			100								
BLK												
HSP	71	67		68	58		71					
MUL	75			70								
PAC												
WHT	64	64	50	70	71	56	68					
FRL	60	71	60	60	68	50	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	63%	57%	6%	54%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	58%	1%	58%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	53%	3%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	63%	62%	1%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	66%	3%	61%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	55%	61%	-6%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	62%	60%	2%	51%	11%

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 which showed the lowest performance is ELA (60%). The contributing factors to last year's low performance include the following:

1. Inconsistent monitoring with feedback on whole and small group ELA instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidenced-based practices.
2. Teacher/team collaborative planning of evidenced-based practices- For example, planning on ways to implement tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving, differentiation and acceleration.

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

The data component which showed the greatest decline was 5th grade Science (67% to 62%). The factors that contributed to this decline include the following:

1. Teacher placement/movement
2. Teacher pedagogy and collaborative planning
3. Scheduling- For example, ESE pull outs, Chorus

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.

Currently, there is no gap compared to the state average.

ELA- State 50%, School 60%

Math- State 56%, School 62%

Science- State 51%, School 62%

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

ELA, Math, and Science components did not show improvement for the 2022/23 school year; however, our school team has revised our school improvement goals and action steps to ensure growth for the 2023/24 school year.

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

1. The number of students scoring a Level 1 according to F.A.S.T. in ELA and Math in grade 5
2. Schoolwide attendance

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

1. Collaborative planning (coaching, modeling, navigating resources, lesson studies, learning walks, peer feedback, unit planning and scheduling, and professional development)
2. Student leadership (student leadership binders, student-led conferences, student leadership days)
3. Differentiation and Acceleration
3. Schoolwide implementation of PBIS and Leader in Me (coaching, modeling, professional development, parent-teacher communication, and staff connectedness)

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.

1. Collaborative planning- It is imperative that there is intentional planning and the use of time to plan collaboratively; determining learning targets/success criteria, deepen understanding of the Florida B.E.S.T. standards and Science State Standards, review end of unit assessments (backwards planning), and plan for small group instruction using on-going formative assessment data).
2. Student leadership- When students track, monitor, and reflect on their data they make gains in taking ownership of their work and build confidence.
3. Differentiation and Acceleration- When teachers differentiate, they meet each student's individual interests, needs, and strengths. Furthermore, when teachers accelerate the learning, they help provide just-in-time learning for students as they struggle with a grade-level concept.

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 8% (from 62% to 70%), as measured by the Florida's State Academic Standards of Science (FSASS) by May 2024.

Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 10% (from 60% to 70%), as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.) by May 2024.

Proficiency in Mathematics will increase 8% (from 62% to 70%), as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.) by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

1. Collaborative planning/Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)- Instructional leaders will be active participants to engage in mutual learning.
2. Student Leadership- Student-led conferences, leadership binders (tracking data and goal setting), and student leadership days.
3. Differentiation and acceleration- Instructional leaders will conduct daily walkthroughs with timely and specific feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eliza Defant (defante@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.)

1. Teacher clarity (Hattie, Fisher, Frye)
2. Corrective feedback
3. Differentiated instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. As teachers become more skilled in this strategy, 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.

2. Teacher corrective feedback. Decades of research clearly demonstrate that for novices (comprising virtually all students), direct, explicit instruction is more effective and more efficient than partial guidance. A review of 70 studies indicates that failure to provide strong instructional support produced measurable loss of learning: minimal guidance can increase the achievement gap.

3. The most important factor in differentiation that helps students achieve more and feel more engaged in school is being sure that what teachers differentiate is high-quality curriculum and instruction.

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 3 - Promising 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 Instructional Leaders will meet regularly to collaboratively plan to increase teacher mastery of curriculum and instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

By When: Established process in August and continue throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Instructional leaders will recruit/retain teacher leaders to help staff with professional development, support, and modeling. For example, ELA Champions, Module roll out trainings, and STEM.

Person Responsible: Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

By When: By August/September and throughout the 2023/24 school year.

Teachers and Instructional leaders will analyze a variety of data points throughout the school year to plan for on-going professional Development (ie. FAST, Progress monitoring, formative assessments, ELA and Math mid and end of unit assessments, science unit assessments, Dreambox, Istation).

Person Responsible: Jyllene Durocher (durocherj@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Teachers and Instructional leaders will collaborate to provide purposeful peer feedback, engage in on-going professional development (B.E.S.T. standards, curriculum, and Leader in Me), and develop understanding in consistent structures for planning/PLCs where teachers engage in data/student work analysis as preparing for upcoming lessons, including scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible: Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Teachers and instructional leaders will 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 (Example- Grade level Wildly Important Goals-WIGs; Student Leadership binders).

Person Responsible: Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Teachers and instructional leaders will ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and intervention, based on data, including supports for students with expectational needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced tasks for students above the benchmark.

Person Responsible: Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Teachers and instructional leaders will utilize, monitor, and implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmarks in the early grades using on-going formative assessment data (ELFAC).

Person Responsible: Jyllene Durocher (durocherj@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Teachers will implement student-led conferences to allow students to share their academic goals and progress with family members.

Person Responsible: Marge Siemon (siemonm@pcsb.org)

By When: September/Oct. 2023, Feb. 16th, April 26th, and/or May 23rd

Instructional leaders will utilize a walkthrough tool to provide weekly feedback to individual teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidenced-based practices in ELA, Math, and Science which are impacting student achievement with the entire staff (ex. weekly updates, staff meetings, curriculum meetings).

Person Responsible: Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Teachers will employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including but not limited to enhancing the student experience.

Person Responsible: Jyllene Durocher (durocherj@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Teachers and Instructional leaders will attend ELA Champion meetings three times per year and partner to collaborate and focus on strengthening practices to support implementation of B.E.S.T. standards and ELA curriculum aligned to the standards.

Person Responsible: Jyllene Durocher (durocherj@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023/24 school year.

School Literacy Leadership team will plan family reading nights grounded in family friendly evidenced-based practices to support the home-school connection.

Person Responsible: Jyllene Durocher (durocherj@pcsb.org)

By When: By September 2023 and January 2024.

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

The 2022-23 schoolwide attendance rate is 89.3% with 69 students missing 10% or more. Based on the prior school year, the number of students missing 10% or more has not improved. This is reflective amongst students not meeting grade level proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of students missing 10% or more to decrease by 3% as measured by the Child Study Team monthly reports.

Monitoring:

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

School Child Study Team will monitor monthly attendance reports, communicate about absences with teachers, contact families, and work collaboratively to determine how to best support our student's attendance.

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.)

Strengthen schoolwide culture for all staff to build relationships with students and their families. When students are consecutively absent for 2+ days, best practice is to reach out to the family about absences. Utilize portal to document communication when students are absent consecutively. Reaching out to discuss the important of attendance with families is crucial to student success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Fostering positive relationships with our students and families will improve communication about attendance. Increasing efforts to reach out to families when students are absent will increase the understanding of the importance of attendance. We must improve our practice of tracking attendance and monitor the efforts made to improve the daily attendance rate.

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.

The school social worker and guidance counselor will identify relevant community resources and develop partnerships to better serve students' needs.

Person Responsible: Vickey Sboukis (sboukiv@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023/24 school year.

Teachers and instructional leaders will create consistent and predictable environments where expectations are explicit so that the whole school community knows how to be successful. For example, creating a positive school culture through Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS).

Person Responsible: Jyllene Durocher (durocherj@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023/24 school year.

Teachers and instructional leaders will implement clear school bullying and harassment policies and recognize and celebrate students when they are engaging in successful behaviors.

Person Responsible: Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023/24 school year.

Teachers and school leaders will foster positive relationships: Ensuring every student has a meaningful connection to at least one trusted adult in school that is not dependent on academic performance and utilize restorative practices to resolve conflict school-wide.

Person Responsible: Leslie Bemnowski (bemnowskil@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023/24 school year.

Teachers and school leaders will ensure students feel safe to express emotions, express their unique identities, and are encouraged to take academic risks to further their learning.

Person Responsible: Leslie Bemnowski (bemnowskil@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023/24 school year.

Teachers will demonstrate commitment to children and families beyond the classroom. For example, attending various school events after hours.

Person Responsible: Vickey Sboukis (sboukisiv@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023/24 school year.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Students with disabilities are currently an ESSA subgroup. Third through fifth grade SWD demonstrated an average of 22% proficiency during the 2022-23 school year. SWD performed below grade level in Math, Science and Reading. There has been a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-appropriate standards. There is a lack of services taking place for SWD within the classroom setting where they have more access to the appropriate access to grade-level content and specially designed instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student with Disabilities proficiency in ELA will increase 28% (22% to 50%) and Math will increase 24% (26% to 50%), as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) by May 2024. In addition, Students with Disabilities proficiency in Science will increase 9% (41% to 50%), as measured by the Science State Assessment by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

1. Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST)- October, January, May
2. Scheduled walkthroughs with timely and specific feedback- prioritizing individual teachers and/or grade levels according to on-going progress monitoring and progress of Individualized Education Plans (IEPs)
3. Instructional Support Model (ISM) and Peer walkthroughs
4. Individual and grade level data chats
5. On-going professional learning communities and collaborative planning

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eliza Defant (defante@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 provide explicit and direct instruction; multi-sensory approach to all learning and utilizing a systematic approach for the delivery of instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Multi-sensory instruction uses visual, auditory, kinesthetic-tactile modalities in acquisition of reading skills. Direct and explicit instruction includes modeling of the skills along with guided practice until mastery is achieved. Teachers need to be clear, unambiguous, direct, and visible- until students meet mastery. Systematic instruction requires the teacher to break down lessons into sequential and manageable steps that go from simple to complex skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 3 - Promising 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.

Support services for students with disabilities will take place within the classroom setting unless there is a something about the classroom environment that prohibits students from receiving the instruction.

Person Responsible: Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Teachers will provide grade level instruction that is aligned to student's IEP goals and specially designed to meet the student's unique needs.

Person Responsible: Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Teachers will collect data and monitor progress towards IEP goals and objectives on an intentional and regular schedule. Adjust services and accommodations if supported by data.

Person Responsible: Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year and at the conclusion of the end of each grading period.

Teachers will use evidence-based practices for students with disabilities to teach foundational literacy and math skills.

Person Responsible: Jyllene Durocher (durocherj@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Teachers will employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to positive expectations for success; novel tasks or other approaches to stimulate curiosity; meaningful tasks related to student interests and cultural background; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.

Person Responsible: Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Behavioral Specialist will support teachers with in-class modeling of skills needed for data collection and behavioral support.

Person Responsible: Colby Barrett (barrettc@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Instructional leaders will provide embedded professional development and coaching supports centered around utilizing data to drive instruction.

Person Responsible: Jyllene Durocher (durocherj@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Instructional leaders will develop weekly walkthroughs to ensure instructional supports are in place during core instruction and independent practice for students with exceptional needs. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.

Person Responsible: Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

EBD teachers will engage in professional development, planning, and implement new ELA curriculum in small group rotations so that to differentiate the various student needs and grade levels.

Person Responsible: Mary Wightman (wightmanm@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023/24 school year.

Teacher leaders will help train other teachers on the use of assistive technology.

Person Responsible: Eliza Defant (defante@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023/24 school year.

ESE/VE teachers and instructional leaders will meet once per month to collaborate on IEP data collection, meeting schedules, student-achievement/growth, and problem-solving.

Person Responsible: Colby Barrett (barrettc@pcsb.org)

By When: Once per month throughout the 2023/24 school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School Advisory Council (SAC) is a team of people representing various segments of the community, parents, teachers, students, administrators, support staff, business/ industry people and other interested community members. The purpose of a SAC is to assist in the preparation and evaluation (developing and evaluating) of the results of the school improvement plan and to assist the principal with the annual school budget. SAC will review funding allocations with the principal to ensure resources are allocated based on student needs- focusing on Students with Disabilities.