Safety Harbor Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Safety Harbor Elementary School

535 5TH AVE N, Safety Harbor, FL 34695

http://www.planetshes.com

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Safety Harbor Elementary School is to educate and prepare each student for college, career and life.

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
Palmer, Cecilia	Principal	Instructional and operational leader in the school community. Focus includes improving student outcomes through hiring, development support, supervision and retention of high quality instructional support staff. Create a culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for stakeholders.
Stryker, Wendy	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal - curriculum, instructional materials manager, testing coordinator, ELL chairperson, PBIS coordinator, transportation coordinator
Yowler, Emily	School Counselor	School Counselor, MTSS and 504 Coordinator
Hazelton, Scott	Behavior Specialist	Monitor school-wide behavior data, develop and monitor behavior interventions and plans (PBIP, FBA), coach instructional staff on relevant behavior interventions and strategies, facilitate small groups (ie.. social skills). When needed, facilitate the collection of behavior data which is used to support decisions related to student IEP's and behavior plans. Active role in our School Based Leadership Team and PBIS team.
Denton, Sarah	Psychologist	MTSS, Assessing and assisting in supporting individual student needs
Mooney, Alexis	Attendance/ Social Work	Social Worker, Attendance, Child Study Team

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 are involved in the development of the SIP at all stages including by means of an annual survey for families, students and staff during the school year, a SIP review and planning meeting in the summer, and through our SAC which includes members from all stakeholder demographics. Time is taken to review and analyze school data. Our Area of Focus is determined and an action plan is devised with strategies to maximize school improvement.

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))

Each goal in the School Improvement plan will be monitored by using a PDSA (Plan, Do, Study, Act) process that will include creating checkpoints, ensuring fidelity of implementation and adjusting goals and actions as necessary.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	35%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	50%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B

	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	13	14	15	13	6	10	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	13	15	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	18	11	9	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	2	8	6	6	4	0	0	0	30
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	3	5	3	6	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	21	20	13	17	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	24	12	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	27	17	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	4	6	3	0	0	0	14

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	20	21	20	13	17	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	24	12	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	27	17	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	4	6	3	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
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*	57	54	53	63	55	56	65		
ELA Learning Gains				62			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			61		
Math Achievement*	63	61	59	67	51	50	63		
Math Learning Gains				69			76		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			57		
Science Achievement*	66	62	54	65	62	59	76		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	79	64	59	72			41		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	316
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	486
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	20	Yes	1	1
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	58			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	67			

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%
FRL	54			

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	44			
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	60			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	54			

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	57			63			66					79
SWD	20			24			30				4	
ELL	13			40			10				4	79
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			37							2	
HSP	52			58			55				5	73
MUL	40			50							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	62			69			75				4	
FRL	44			51			56				5	79

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	63	62	43	67	69	45	65					72
SWD	32	60	47	39	53	44	32					
ELL	30	61	50	35	61							72
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	33		42	50		36					
HSP	58	65	55	60	68	60	43					67
MUL	61	63		70	56							
PAC												
WHT	66	66	50	71	74	42	77					
FRL	47	57	43	50	65	50	49					73

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	65	69	61	63	76	57	76					41
SWD	32	42	50	32	47		47					
ELL	22			33								41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	54			36								
HSP	42	67		47	87		50					44
MUL	68			64								
PAC												
WHT	72	72	62	71	80	58	81					
FRL	48	57	60	48	66	46	58					43

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	62%	57%	5%	54%	8%
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	63%	62%	1%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	66%	4%	61%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	64%	61%	3%	55%	9%

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

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

English Language Arts showed the lowest performance with 59% of 3rd - 5th grade students attaining a level 3 or above on the Spring FAST ELA assessment. This was a decline of 4 percentage points compared to the FSA ELA in the spring of 2022. This is the second consecutive year of decline in ELA which lost 2 percentage points from 2021 to 2022. The effect of Covid-19 is still evident as students who were in primary grades during school closure and online learning are moving into the intermediate grades. One contributing factor to the decline in ELA performance may be that teachers were making the shift to new standards, new curriculum, and a new testing platform.

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

ELA was not only our lowest performing area, but it was also the area that showed the greatest overall decline going from 63% of 3rd - 5th grade students proficient in 2022 to 59% proficient in 2023. An area for improvement that was revealed through district ISM visits was the need for an increase in differentiated instruction. This along with the previously stated contributing factors has had an impact on ELA performance.

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.

Safety Harbor Elementary exceeded both the state and district averages on FAST ELA and Reading for grades 3-5. The state and district average was also exceeded on the 5th grade SSA science assessment.

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

The area showing the most improvement was Science. The SSA scores went from 65% in 2022 to 67% 2023. A baseline assessment was given at the beginning of the 2022-23 school year which enabled staff to plan intentionally to fill in any gaps in learning as that were discovered. Measures were taken to assure that students had a conceptual understanding of applicable academic vocabulary.

Fourth grade ELA performance and math performance increased from 51% to 66% and 58% to 67% respectively.

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

One potential concern based on the EWS data is attendance. There were 71 students who missed greater than 10% of the school year in 2022-23; this accounts for 12% of all students in K-5.

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

1. ELA - Bolstering ELA instruction, especially in primary grades, by assuring that foundational ELA skills are effectively taught, and instruction is differentiated to meet the need of all students.
2. Subgroups - Focus on our Black, ELL and SWD subgroups are performing below expectations in both ELA and Math with a focus on academic vocabulary.
3. Grade 3 ELA - A goal for 3rd grade ELA will be set to ensure that students are achieving up to standard during this pivotal grade.
4. Attendance

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.

FAST/SSA data collected from the 2022-23 school year showed students performing at a proficiency rate of 59% in ELA, 65% in Math, and 67% in Science. Lack of consistency in providing students with standards aligned differentiated instruction and tasks may be a contributing factor.

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

Proficiency in ELA will increase 10% from 59% to 69%, as measured by FAST ELA PM3, 2024.
Proficiency in Math will increase 10% from 65% to 75%, as measured by FAST Math PM3, 2024.
Proficiency in Science will increase 10% from 67% to 77%, as measured by SSA Spring, 2024.

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

Student data will be monitored using the prescribed state progress monitoring platform, district and classroom assessments. PLC/SBLT will monitor the implementation of data driven PLCs, collaborative planning, professional development, and benchmark-based instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@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.)

Deepen understanding of the Florida's BEST/FSASS Standards as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes by using district curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students. Accomplishing this will involve establishing ELA, Math, and Science goals by educators and students in order to focus learning.

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

Shifting from simply stating a standard to communicating learning expectations ensures that goals are appropriate, challenging, and attainable. When goals are specific, revisited throughout the lesson and connect to prior learning, they become clearer to students. Effective teaching establishes clear goals related to the critical content of the standards that students are learning, situates goals within the learning progressions, and uses the goals to inform instructional decisions. Through this process students will develop their confidence and achieve their goals. Teachers will use data and set goals that will allow for differentiated with a focus on academic vocabulary.

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.

•ELA Champion / MAST
•Data Driven PLCs
•Collaborate and strategically plan implementation of the curriculum to maximize impact on student learning utilizing the B1G-M, Gold Document, and Science standards progression documents
•Just-in-time content area PD: coaches / teacher leaders, district rollouts, planning hubs, planning TDEs
•Consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard
•Utilize curricular materials to create standards-aligned, rigorous tasks and engaging student experiences
•Opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals and make choices.
•Provide resources for building academic vocabulary
•Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement
•Data Folders, goal setting, and progress monitoring
•Student Led Conferences
•Intentionally plan for differentiation to achieve high outcomes for all learners with a focus on our ESSA subgroups

Person Responsible: Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)

By When: This work will be ongoing throughout the school year in order to reach our goal by the end of the 2023-24 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

While improving literacy outcomes for students is critical in all grade levels, third grade is a pivotal year where students must show proficiency in reading. In 2022-23, 51% of third grade students obtained a proficiency level of 3 or higher on the FAST ELA Assessment. The goal is to ensure whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

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

Overall proficiency in grades 3-5 will increase from x to x as measured by FAST ELA PM4 2024. Third grade ELA scores will increase from 51% to 70% of third graders scoring an achievement level of 3 or higher as measured by FAST ELA PM3 2024.

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

Data from classroom, district, and state assessments will be analyzed through work in Grade Level PLCs after each cycle of assessments along with utilization of administrative walkthroughs to support this work.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@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.)

Explicit and systematic instruction
Scaffolded instruction to support individual needs
Corrective feedback
Differentiated instruction

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

Explicit instructional practice for novices in learning new content, skill, or concept: 1) full, clear explanations, 2) teacher modeling, 3) Provide a "worked-out" sample with full teacher explanation, 3) Full guidance during student practice, 4) Teacher corrective feedback. Teachers are more effective when providing explicit guidance with practice and feedback rather than requiring student discovery while learning new skills/concepts. 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.

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.

- Support through ELA Champions
- Module Roll Outs
- PD on High Leverage Strategies / Implementation of High Leverage Strategies
- Collaborative Planning for small group benchmark alignment
- PLC / Data Chats

Person Responsible: Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)

By When: This work will be ongoing throughout the school year in order to reach our goal by the end of the 2023-24 school year.

#3. 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 overall attendance rate for 2022-23 was 87.7% with 11 students absent 20% or more of the school year and 71 students absent 10% or more of the school year. Regular attendance is critical in order for students to succeed in school; a plan must be implemented to obtain evidence as to the cause of the absences and provide an intervention that will promote student attendance.

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

The percentage of students absent greater than 10% of the school year will decrease from 12.7% to 5% as measured by the Child Study Team's monthly reports.

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

The Child Study Team will monitor the progress and take steps to communicate with families and staff to improve attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@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.)

The goal of CST is to give families the support they need and provide students with a positive school experience in order to increase attendance. Along with a system for tracking, problem-solving, and monitoring attendance, a system for celebrating outstanding attendance can facilitate improved attendance.

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

It is imperative to understand why students are absent in order to find a solution. As CST works to build relationships with families and students who are at risk of frequent absences, they will be able to work together to find solutions. By promoting attendance school-wide, students and families will grow to see the importance of daily attendance and reap the benefits of being in school and on time each and every day.

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.

• CST to review data from 2022-23 to identify at risk students and communicate this information with teachers, so they can provide support from day one.
• CST and teachers will continue to communicate with families as data is reviewed monthly or sooner if necessary.

• Work to provide students with a positive climate and culture will take place through student experiences in the class and in after school enrichment clubs.
• Develop and implement a classroom or grade-level recognition program to celebrate classes/grade levels with outstanding attendance.

Person Responsible: Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)

By When: This work will be ongoing throughout the school year in order to reach our goal by the end of the 2023-24 school year.

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

Subgroups including Black, ELL, and SWD were performing at a proficiency rate of 37%, 7%, and 19% consecutively in ELA, and 37%, 37%, and 28% consecutively in Math. This data identifies the need for growth in all content areas with the most critical need in ELA and with our named subgroups. Lack of consistency in providing students with standards aligned differentiated instruction and tasks may be a contributing factor.

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

Our Subgroups – Black, ELL, and SWD will increase in proficiency in from 37%, 7%, and 19% (consecutively) to 69%, and from 37%, 37%, and 28% (consecutively) to 75% in Math as measured by FAST ELA and Math PM3, 2024. This lofty goal for our subgroups will raise them to scores equivalent to their peers schoolwide.

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

Student data will be monitored using the prescribed state progress monitoring platform, district and classroom assessments. PLC/SBLT will monitor the implementation of data driven PLCs, collaborative planning, professional development, and benchmark-based 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.)

Deepen understanding of the Florida's BEST/FSASS Standards as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes by using district curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students. Accomplishing this will involve establishing ELA, Math, and Science goals by educators and students in order to focus learning.

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

Shifting from simply stating a standard to communicating learning expectations ensures that goals are appropriate, challenging, and attainable. When goals are specific, revisited throughout the lesson and connect to prior learning, they become clearer to students. Effective teaching establishes clear goals related to the critical content of the standards that students are learning, situates goals within the learning progressions, and uses the goals to inform instructional decisions. Through this process students will develop their confidence and achieve their goals. Teachers will use data and set goals that will allow for differentiated with a focus on academic vocabulary.

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.

•ELA Champion / MAST
•Data Driven PLCs
•Collaborate and strategically plan implementation of the curriculum to maximize impact on student learning utilizing the B1G-M, Gold Document, and Science standards progression documents
•Just-in-time content area PD: coaches / teacher leaders, district rollouts, planning hubs, planning TDEs
•Consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard
•Utilize curricular materials to create standards-aligned, rigorous tasks and engaging student experiences
•Opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals and make choices.
•Provide resources for building academic vocabulary
•Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement
•Data Folders, goal setting, and progress monitoring
•Student Led Conferences
•Intentionally plan for differentiation to achieve high outcomes for all

Person Responsible: Cecilia Palmer (palmerce@pcsb.org)

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