

Pinellas County Schools

Northwest 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	29
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	29
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Northwest Elementary School

5601 22ND AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33710

<http://www.northwest-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Northwest School Community is dedicated to building relationships that encourage the development of academic success, emotional intelligence, critical thinking and strong, caring citizens in a safe learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% student success

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Maker, Casey	Principal	Job duties and responsibilities of school improvement team members include serving as instructional coaches by providing effective feedback and support to instructional teams and individual staff members. Members will meet weekly to address, monitor, and problem-solve around barriers to reaching school improvement goals.
Wahl , Amanda	Assistant Principal	Job duties and responsibilities of school improvement team members include serving as instructional coaches by providing effective feedback and support to instructional teams and individual staff members. Members will meet weekly to address, monitor, and problem-solve around barriers to reaching school improvement goals.
Brisson, Marie	Instructional Coach	Job duties and responsibilities of school improvement team members include serving as instructional coaches by providing effective feedback and support to instructional teams and individual staff members. Members will meet weekly to address, monitor, and problem-solve around barriers to reaching school improvement goals. Additionally, our MTSS coach monitors Tier II and Tier III data and allocates resources to support instruction an intervention. Members will meet weekly to address, monitor, and problem-solve around barriers to reaching school improvement goals varying levels of need.
Rorer, Samuel	Behavior Specialist	Job duties and responsibilities of school improvement team members include serving as instructional coaches by providing effective feedback and support to instructional teams and individual staff members. Members will meet weekly to address, monitor, and problem-solve around barriers to reaching school improvement goals. Specifically, the behavior specialist will be responsible for monitoring behavior data (10 point system, referrals and infractions) and reporting out to the team.
Snoots, Sebrina	Teacher, ESE	Job duties and responsibilities of school improvement team members include serving as instructional coaches by providing effective feedback and support to instructional teams and individual staff members. Members will meet weekly to address, monitor, and problem-solve around barriers to reaching school improvement goals.
Wood, Chris	Attendance/ Social Work	Job duties and responsibilities of school improvement team members include serving as instructional coaches by providing effective feedback and support to instructional teams and individual staff members. Members will meet weekly to address, monitor, and problem-solve around barriers to reaching school improvement goals. Specifically, the Social Worker will monitor and share attendance data.
Spaights, Rene	School Counselor	Job duties and responsibilities of school improvement team members include serving as instructional coaches by providing effective feedback and support

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		to instructional teams and individual staff members. Members will meet weekly to address, monitor, and problem-solve around barriers to reaching school improvement goals.
Camacho, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Job duties and responsibilities of school improvement team members include serving as instructional coaches by providing effective feedback and support to instructional teams and individual staff members. Members will meet weekly to address, monitor, and problem-solve around barriers to reaching school improvement goals.

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.

Stakeholders were involved in a variety of ways. Family and community members provided input through a survey process, input at school advisory council meetings, parent teacher association meetings and other forms of electronic communication. The Northwest staff played a critical role in developing this school improvement plan. Staff members met monthly to discuss specified goals, implement action plans, monitor SIP implementation, and give input and feedback towards future goals, strategies, and action steps.

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 will be monitored through regular school-based leadership team meetings. Goals will be monitored and problem-solving will take place within a rotational schedule to monitor each goal monthly. Additionally, SIP Goal committees will meet monthly to continue to support implementation and monitoring of progress towards their specific school improvement goal.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%

Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
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	2	11	9	12	22	20	0	0	0	76	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	14	9	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	13	10	0	0	0	25	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	7	1	0	2	0	0	0	11	
	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	1	1	1	0	9	10	0	0	0	22

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	4	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	26	33	27	26	27	0	0	0	139	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	13	15	12	0	0	41	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	20	24	0	0	0	51	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	7	1	0	2	0	0	0	11	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	18	7	11	22	31	0	0	0	91

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	0	1	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	26	33	27	26	27	0	0	0	139	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	13	15	12	0	0	41	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	20	24	0	0	0	51	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	7	1	0	2	0	0	0	11	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	18	7	11	22	31	0	0	0	91

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	0	1	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*	58	54	53	54	55	56	50		
ELA Learning Gains				62			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57			44		
Math Achievement*	61	61	59	62	51	50	57		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains				61			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				32			25		
Science Achievement*	54	62	54	61	62	59	47		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	67	64	59	56			52		

** 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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	297
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

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	31	Yes	4	2
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	28	Yes	1	1
HSP	55			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	53			

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	30	Yes	3	1
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	41			
HSP	58			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	50			

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	58			61			54					67
SWD	32			24							4	45
ELL	51			70			40				5	67
AMI												
ASN	59			76							2	
BLK	42			27			33				4	
HSP	45			66			44				5	68
MUL	77			46							2	
PAC												
WHT	65			70			63				5	58
FRL	50			53			49				5	65

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	54	62	57	62	61	32	61					56
SWD	31	44		23	35	17						
ELL	49	59		69	74							56
AMI												
ASN	53	73		73	73							
BLK	28	56	45	36	50	31	41					
HSP	55	59	55	71	62		54					50
MUL	42	40		50								
PAC												
WHT	64	67	64	67	64	36	70					60
FRL	46	56	48	55	56	36	50					53

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	50	54	44	57	55	25	47					52
SWD	25	39	40	29	21	10	16					
ELL	52			75								52
AMI												
ASN	47			68								50
BLK	39	50		29	23		15					
HSP	43	50		65	71		43					45
MUL	38			38								
PAC												
WHT	58	56		63	59		56					61
FRL	43	54	45	48	43	18	36					59

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	55%	57%	-2%	54%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	58%	11%	58%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	52%	53%	-1%	50%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	64%	62%	2%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	66%	3%	61%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	55%	1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	60%	-7%	51%	2%

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.

Based on 2023 FAST performance data, third grade ELA showed the lowest performance relative to other reporting categories for school grade. During the 2022-23 school year, grade 3 had more students than any other tested grade level. This grade level contained many students at varying reading levels.

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

5th grade science showed the greatest decline from the previous year. Proficiency in science dropped from 61% in 2022 to 54% in 2023. This 5th grade cohort was 57% proficient on the FAST ELA assessment. Reading proficiency and comprehension were possible factors to the decline.

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.

Based on 2023 FAST performance data, science achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. This 5th grade cohort was 57% proficient on the FAST ELA assessment. Reading proficiency and comprehension were possible factors to the decline.

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

ELA demonstrated the greatest improvement compared to other content areas. Achievement in ELA increased from 54% of students proficient in 2022 to 60% of students proficient in 2023. More specifically, 70% of 4th grade students were proficient on the state assessment. Instructional staff focused heavily on deepening understanding of new BEST Standards and implementing effective standards-based instruction.

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

One potential area for concern entering the 2023-24 school year is attendance and punctuality of students in grades K-2. Loss of valuable core instruction is an area of concern and will be a prioritized accordingly.

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

1. ELA Achievement with focus on K-3
2. Mathematics Achievement

3. Science Achievement
4. Mathematics learning gains for students with disabilities and lowest quartile.
5. ELA learning gains for students with disabilities and lowest quartile.

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.

We expect ELA (English Language Arts) achievement to increase to 65% proficient based on 2024 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking. Based on 2023 FAST data, 40% of students in grades 3-5 were not proficient in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect our level of proficiency to increase from 60% to 65% as measured by the 2024 FAST ELA Reading assessment.

Monitoring:

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

ELA performance will be monitored by the school-based leadership team, school improvement goal committees, teachers and other systems of support. Teams will use on-going FAST PM data, Istation Indicators of Progress, Running Records, the ELFAC, and embedded module formative assessments to problem-solve and drive instruction.

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.)

1. Ensure whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block for both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles, including explicit and gradual instruction, differentiated instruction, collaborative structures and learning through writing.
2. Build Engagement Strategies, learning styles, scaffolding, movement, and collaboration into lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research demonstrates that direct, explicit instruction is more effective and efficient than partial guidance. Learning is increased when teachers provide explicit guidance with practice and feedback. Differentiated instruction aims to vary teaching to create the best learning experience possible for students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

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 assessment data.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023

Provide on-going coaching and support for planning and implementing differentiated whole group and small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023

Engage students in reading, writing, and discussion with feedback ensuring ample time is given to students to read and write appropriate grade-level text with high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023

Students will routinely participate in processing content through writing using reflective journaling, focused note taking, and annotating text.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023

Teachers and students will engage in higher level questioning and Costa's levels of thinking during class lessons, discussions and problem-solving activities.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

Develop and utilize structures for inquiry and collaboration among students to improve questioning and reasoning skills, including class discussion protocols, problem-solving activities, and collaborative study groups.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

Establish and maintain learning partnerships with families by developing routines for proactive communication, conducting and documenting regular parent/teacher conferences, and providing explicit grade level strategies to improve reading.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: May, 2024

Incorporate technology and PCS Connects devices to develop research skills and provide access to digital information and literacy sources.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

#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.

We expect Mathematics achievement to increase to 68% proficient based on 2024 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking. Based on 2023 FAST data, 37% of students in grades 3-5 were not proficient in mathematics.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect our level of proficiency to increase from 63% to 68% as measured by the 2024 FAST Mathematics assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Mathematics performance will be monitored by the school-based leadership team, school improvement goal committees, teachers and other systems of support. Teams will use on-going FAST PM data, Dreambox Launchpad data, topic assessments, exit tickets, and benchmark assessments to problem-solve and drive instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Casey Maker (makerc@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. Implement whole group and small group instruction designed according to evidence-based principles, including facilitating meaningful discourse, posing purposeful questions, and eliciting and using evidence of student thinking.
2. Build Engagement Strategies, learning styles, scaffolding, movement, and collaboration into lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective teaching of mathematics facilitates discourse and poses questions to build shared understanding of mathematical ideas and advances students reasoning skills. Additionally, eliciting evidence of student thinking allows for assessment of progress towards understanding and can allow for instruction to adjust in ways that support and extend student learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

Person Responsible: Amanda Wahl (wahlam@pcsb.org)

By When: August/September 2023

Utilize multiple forms of formative assessment and the Data PLC Protocol to develop plans using differentiated resources to inform future instruction.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: August/September 2023

Students will routinely engage in processing mathematics content through writing using reflective journaling and focus notetaking.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: August/September 2023

Teachers and students will engage in higher level questioning and Costa's levels of thinking during class lessons, discussions and problem-solving activities.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

Develop and utilize structures for inquiry and collaboration among students to improve questioning and reasoning skills. Including class discussion protocols, problem-solving activities, and collaborative study groups.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

Establish and maintain learning partnerships with families by developing routines for proactive communication, conducting and documenting regular parent/teacher conferences, and providing understanding to grade level mathematics standards.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: August/September 2023

Incorporate technology and PCS Connects devices to develop research skills and provide access to supplemental mathematics materials including Dreambox Learning. Grade two students will increase to 7 weekly Dreambox lessons during the second semester.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: August/September 2023

Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmarks, including targeted instruction and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.

Person Responsible: Amanda Wahl (wahlam@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023

#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.

Based on the 2022-2023 SSA, 47% of our fifth-grade students were not proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect our Science proficiency to increase from 53% to 65% as measured by the 2023-2024 SSA.

Monitoring:

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

Science performance will be monitored by the school-based leadership team, school improvement goal committees, teachers and other systems of support. Grade-level teams will use district assessments, unit tests, and exit tickets, as well as other formative assessments. The 5th grade team will use the diagnostic assessments and the Mock SSA.

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.)

1. Continue to implement whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles (student-centered learning, purposeful questioning, student discourse, learning through writing and collaborative structures).
2. Build Engagement Strategies, learning styles, scaffolding, movement, and collaboration into lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Classroom discussion allows students to process content and improve communication skills by voicing their opinions and thoughts. Utilizing classroom discussions, through collaborative structures, creates an environment where everyone learns from each other. Learning through writing (focused note-taking, reflections...) is a high-yield strategy that also ensures a high level of student engagement.

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.

Classroom teachers will implement instructional practices that result in students doing the work of the lesson (higher-order questioning, limited teacher talk, collaborative structures).

Person Responsible: Amanda Wahl (wahlam@pcsb.org)

By When: August/September 2023

Classroom teachers will utilize the 3-I instructional routine (Ignite, Investigate, Inform Instruction) to ensure daily science lessons are presented as a whole while monitoring student understanding through the use of formative assessments.

Person Responsible: Amanda Wahl (wahlam@pcsb.org)

By When: August/September 2023

Adapt district curriculum materials to support differentiated, rigorous instruction and interventions.

Person Responsible: Amanda Wahl (wahlam@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-2024 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..

Person Responsible: Amanda Wahl (wahlam@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

All 1-5 grade students will be assigned a device to integrate into core lessons and increase time on inquiry, gaming and I Station Science lessons

Person Responsible: Catherine Krajnik (krajnikc@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023

Utilize AVID strategies within Science lessons: including focused note-taking, journal entries, reflection prompts and learning logs.

Person Responsible: Marie Brisson (brissonm@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Provide a family training session on grade-level strategies to improve science knowledge and science projects.

Person Responsible: Amanda Wahl (wahlam@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Administration will provide just-in-time feedback through iObservation, face-to-face feedback, conferences, emails and handwritten notes.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#4. 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.

Based on most recent ESSA Federal Index metrics, students with disabilities were at 30% proficient on the 2023 Reading FAST assessment. This critical area must be addressed to support the individual needs of our students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the percentage of students with disabilities meeting or exceeding proficiency on the state assessment and move from 30% to 50% proficiency as measured by the ESSA Federal Index.

Monitoring:

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

School-based Leadership will monitor data for all students with disabilities, including FAST PM cycles, Aims Web, ISIP, module and benchmark assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Wahl (wahlam@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.)

Ensure small group instruction and 1:1 specially designed instruction is designed and implemented in alignment with evidence-based practices.

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. Direct explanations and clearly explained skills compromises explicit instruction. Teachers are clear, unambiguous, direct and visible- until students meet mastery. Systematic instruction includes breaking 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 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 use of appropriate practices and scaffolding to ensure students' needs are met.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: September, 2023

Based on IEP goals, evidence-based practices for students with disabilities will be built into all core instruction, and planned for across ELA/Math/Science.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: September, 2023

Coordinate and assign research-based interventions aligned to IEP goals.

Person Responsible: Marie Brisson (brissonm@pcsb.org)

By When: September, 2023

Plan and deliver professional development associated with utilizing a multi-sensory, direct, explicit way of teaching.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: October, 2023

#5. 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.

During the 2022-2023 school year, 33 students received at least one referral, resulting in 62 referrals in total. 71% of those referrals were given due to physical conflict (physical contact on an adult, peer or a major/minor fight).

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect our number of referrals, for physical conflict (physical contact on an adult, peer or a major/minor fight), to decrease from 44 to 33 referrals, which would be a decrease of 23% as measured by Focus.

Monitoring:

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

Referrals will be monitored, at least monthly, by our behavior specialist and shared with the staff. Our Tier 2 PLC will meet weekly to problem-solve and ensure plans are being followed with fidelity. In addition to referrals, we utilize a 10-point system to track and monitor behavior. Students who consistently receive less than 80% of their points will be discussed in our Leadership Tier 2 PLC and plans will be put into place to improve outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samuel Rorer (rorers@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.)

We will continue to implement and refine our PBIS system, with an emphasis on building relationships and teaching social skills and conflict resolution.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that building relationships is one of the most powerful tools to limit situationally inappropriate behaviors. In addition, positive behaviors need to be taught (modeled and reinforced with time for practice and feedback). Since the data shows that physical conflict is our number one reason for referrals, the focus will be on teaching social skills, conflict resolution and self-control.

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 will continue to follow an agreed-upon schedule for engaging in proactive circles, 3 times per week, with a focus on building relationships and teaching social skills, conflict resolution and self-control.

Person Responsible: Amanda Wahl (wahlam@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

We will continue to focus on a 5:1 campaign which promotes 5 positive comments/compliments for each negative comment per individual.

Person Responsible: Amanda Wahl (wahlam@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Establish meaningful communication with families and implement a parent involvement plan that is responsive to the cultural experiences of our families.

Person Responsible: Amanda Wahl (wahlam@pcsb.org)

By When: October 2024

Change our Tier 1 reinforcer to STAR bucks and develop a school store. The behavior specialist will create a schedule for classes to visit the store to spend their STAR bucks.

The behavior specialist will also create a monthly incentive list, based on student feedback to recognize students who receive an average of at least 80% of their weekly points.

Person Responsible: Samuel Rorer (rorers@pcsb.org)

By When: November 2024

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

On the Federal Index, the Black / African-American subgroup scored 41%. Additionally, proficiency levels in English language arts for the Black / African-American subgroup has been below 40% each of the last three years assessed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the percent of Black / African-American students proficient in English language arts from 40% to 65% as measured by the 2024 ELA FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

ELA performance will be monitored by the school-based leadership team, school improvement goal committees, teachers and other systems of support. Teams will use on-going FAST PM data, Istation Indicators of Progress, Running Records, the ELFAC, and embedded module formative assessments to problem-solve and drive instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Casey Maker (makerc@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. Build engagement strategies, all learning styles, scaffolding, movement. and collaboration into lessons.
2. Establish meaningful communication with families and create opportunities to include stakeholders in goal setting, progress monitoring, and developing high expectations for student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Parent participation in children's education improves student achievement. Engaging strategies, including teaching to individuals unique learning styles, engaging in social interaction related to academic content, and scaffolding instruction lead to increased academic performance.

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.

Classroom teachers will collaboratively plan to incorporate movement, music, modeling, collaboration, and monitoring learning with feedback within lessons to increase engagement and learning.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including positive expectations for success, developing compelling introductions to lessons, and implementing meaningful tasks related to student interest and cultural backgrounds.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

Students will routinely participate in goal setting and self- monitoring. Goal setting and progress will be communicated with families.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: October 2023

Families will be surveyed regarding their preferred form of communication. Teachers and staff will communicate academic and behavioral progress that best supports the needs of our families.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: October 2023

Conduct parent teacher conferences at least once per semester. Communicate high expectations for learning, student goals, progress towards goals, and strategies to support.

Person Responsible: Casey Maker (makerc@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

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).

Our school-based leadership team, along with the School Advisory Council, reviews school funding allocations along with various data sources to prioritize allocated resources based on need. Progress toward school improvement goals is analyzed and monitored weekly through the MTSS Framework. Through this problem-solving process, allocated resources are revisited and distributed to support continuous improvement and the changing needs of our students.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

School improvement goals and strategies, school curriculum, assessment, and progress monitoring information will be covered in depth at an annual Title I meeting for stakeholders. Additionally, this

information is also communicated regularly through monthly newsletters, regular parent teacher conferences, proactive phone calls, school-wide messenger (phone, email, sms) and updates on the school website.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We will have numerous parent engagement nights including the Annual Title One Open House, Safety/PBIS Night, Math Night, Science Night, and Literacy Fest. At each of these events we have activities that engage families with academic tasks. This allows parents to witness the high expectations for academic achievement. At these events, we also provide information on how parents can help their child be successful, including materials to be sent home (for example, dice and fluency games for math, books with comprehension questions for ELA...).

Other reasonable support that will be provided for parental involvement will be clear communication between teachers and families, guidance and tips on our school website and in our monthly newsletters.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We will continue to use the monthly testing calendar to drive PLC planning. We will incorporate a planning protocol for all academic subjects. We will use planning time to investigate and align resources for the ELA modules and math units. Next steps for data analysis will be to plan for specific intentional individual needs and connect resources to students. We will use a systematic approach to collaborative team planning to develop interventions and individualized planning. We will implement a set of protocols for PLCS: content, planning, data analysis.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A