

Pinellas County Schools

Blanton 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	31
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	31
VI. Title I Requirements	34
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Blanton Elementary School

6400 54TH AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33709

<http://www.blanton-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.

Our mission is to inspire lifelong learning and to provide opportunities for students to gain knowledge, skills, and develop character for success in our changing world.

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
Roth, Lisa	Principal	
Piland, Cody	Assistant Principal	
Paetzold, Shannen	Instructional Coach	
Macking, Erin	Instructional Coach	
Walsh, Emily	Instructional Media	

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.

Teachers were surveyed in May of 2023 for ideas about family involvement activities and what their personal training needs were. Parents were invited to participate in a similar family engagement survey. After survey data were collected, the School Advisory Committee reviewed the information and decided what activities would be included in the family engagement plan. The School Advisory Committee also reviewed retention data and school test data to help determine which academic goals would be appropriate.

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 Based Leadership Team (SBLT) will review School Improvement Plan progress on a monthly basis for compliance and to ensure that progress is being made. The SBLT will do a mid-year

review in January and will report to the School Advisory Committee (SAC) as well as to the staff. Revisions, if needed, will occur as determined by the SBLT after each review of data.

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	63%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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: C 2018-19: C 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	0	32	29	29	24	18	0	0	0	132	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	30	14	0	0	0	47	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	20	9	0	0	0	31	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	21	18	37	36	32	0	0	0	146

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	4	9	3	5	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	7

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	4	27	32	34	25	19	0	0	0	141	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	17	0	0	0	0	27	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	2	8	11	2	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

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	4	27	32	34	25	19	0	0	0	141	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	17	0	0	0	0	27	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	2	8	11	2	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

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*	39	54	53	44	55	56	42		
ELA Learning Gains				59			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62			21		
Math Achievement*	54	61	59	55	51	50	52		
Math Learning Gains				59			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			33		
Science Achievement*	58	62	54	44	62	59	51		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	64	64	59	76			47		

* 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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	246
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	24	Yes	1	1
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	28	Yes	1	1
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	47			

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	58			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	66			
BLK	46			
HSP	58			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	59			

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	39			54			58					64
SWD	24			33							3	
ELL	26			49			71				5	64
AMI												
ASN	67			75							3	81
BLK	28			40			28				4	
HSP	30			49			43				5	50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	43			62			75				4	
FRL	35			52			55				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	44	59	62	55	59	55	44					76
SWD	38	69	64	53	75	67	40					
ELL	55	63		65	79		55					76
AMI												
ASN	64	50		79	92							45

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	38	52		43	55	54	33					
HSP	41	54		55	62		46					91
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	48	68	73	58	58	55	47					
FRL	40	60	74	52	59	63	45					75

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	42	48	21	52	49	33	51					47
SWD	25	18		45	36		31					
ELL	43	41		47	41		43					47
AMI												
ASN	52			62								
BLK	20	27		30	18		33					
HSP	51	50		56	50		59					39
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	47	40	27	60	52	50	48					
FRL	38	44	14	46	41	33	52					47

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	43%	57%	-14%	54%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	58%	-10%	58%	-10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	30%	53%	-23%	50%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	62%	-11%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	66%	0%	61%	5%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	61%	-12%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	59%	60%	-1%	51%	8%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The data component of ELA showed the lowest performance. The greatest contributing factor to this performance is that the majority of our students are lacking solid ELA foundational skills and comprehension skills. Additionally, the test format of FAST was new for students this year and many of our students had significant amounts of absences and tardies. This has been a trend for several years.

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

The data component of ELA showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The greatest contributing factor to this performance is that the majority of our students are lacking solid ELA foundational skills and comprehension skills. Additionally, the test format of FAST was new for students this year and many of our students had significant amounts of absences and tardies. This has been a trend for several years.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is ELA. The greatest contributing factor to this performance is that the majority of our students are lacking solid ELA foundational skills and comprehension skills. Additionally, the test format of FAST was new for students

this year and many of our students had significant amounts of absences and tardies. This has been a trend for several years.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Science. This year, only one fifth grade teacher taught science content to the entire grade level. In addition, administration taught science content to a small group of students, several days a week, during the second semester.

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

The area of greatest potential concern according to the early warning system was the number of students with 10% or more days absent.

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

Our highest priority for school improvement in the upcoming school year is increasing the percentage of students scoring proficient on the PM3 ELA assessment. Our second highest priority for school improvement is increasing the use of restorative practices and decreasing the number of office discipline referrals.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of African American students achieving ELA proficiency on the 2023 Spring FAST was 23%. The goal for all students achieving ELA proficiency on the 2024 Spring FAST is 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through involvement by the administrative team and coaches in PLCs while planning for standards-based instruction. Student engagement in standards-based instruction will be monitored via walk-throughs and feedback provided by the administrative team. Formative and summative assessment data will be used to monitor students as they move towards proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Roth (rothli@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 direct instruction; multi-sensory approach to all learning; utilize a systematic approach for the delivery of instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Multi-sensory instruction uses visual, auditory, kinesthetic-tactile modalities in acquisition of reading skills. Direct and explicit instruction includes modeling of the skills along with guided practice until mastery is achieved; direct explanations and clearly explained skills comprises 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.

1. Administration will provide teachers with updated high leverage practices
2. Teachers and administrators will monitor the use of appropriate practices and scaffolding to ensure students' needs are met
3. Teachers will participate in professional learning associated with utilizing a multi-sensory, direct, explicit way of teaching

4. The SBLT and MTSS Teams will monitor and discuss African American student achievement data. They will work with classroom teachers to develop action plans for students, based on this data.

Person Responsible: Lisa Roth (rothli@pcsb.org)

By When: Spring 2024

#2. 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.

Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction 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.

The percent of all students achieving proficiency on the 2023 Spring SSA was 51%. The goal for all students achieving proficiency on the 2024 Spring SSA is 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through involvement by the administrative team and coaches in Curriculum Meetings, SBLT Meetings, and grade level PLCs. It will also occur via walk-throughs and feedback provided by the administrative team, and analysis of formative and summative assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Roth (rothli@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teacher Clarity (Hattie, 0.75 effect size)/Learning needs to be challenging (Hattie & Zierer, 10 Mindframes for Visible Learning), Prior Ability (Hattie, 0.82 effect size), Classroom Discussion (Hattie, 0.82 effect size), Feedback (Hattie, 0.70 effect size)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Goals need to be appropriately challenging and provide varying opportunities to monitor progress throughout the lesson. Activating prior knowledge helps students see the connections between previous learning and new instruction, builds on what students already know, provides a framework for learners to better understand new information, and gives instructors formative assessment information to adapt instruction. Classroom discussion is a method of teaching, that involves the entire class in a discussion and creates an environment where everyone learns from each other. The teacher stops lecturing and students get together as a class to discuss an important issue. Classroom discussion allows students to improve communication skills by voicing their opinions and thoughts. Teachers also benefit from classroom discussion as it allows them to see if students have learnt the concepts that are being taught.

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.

1. Teachers will foster an environment of cooperation and collaboration among students including academic language, discussions, and group projects.
2. Science content will be integrated into ELA via myON and Istation.
3. Teachers will regularly assess students (informally and formally) and utilize the data to modify their instruction and provide targeted, actionable feedback to students within whole and small group settings.
4. Students will utilize a scientist's notebook.
5. ESOL Teachers and Bilingual Assistant will support ESOL students with content area vocabulary.

Person Responsible: Cody Piland (pilandc@pcsb.org)

By When: Spring 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our area of focus for positive culture and environment is increasing the use of restorative practices and decreasing the amount of Office Discipline Referrals. These areas are crucial needs as over 65 referrals were administered last school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our number of Office Discipline Referrals at the end of the 22-23 school year was 66, as evidenced in School Profiles. We expect our number of ODRs to decrease to 60 or less at the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored for desired outcome via data in FOCUS and School Profiles.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cody Piland (pilandc@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 evidence-based interventions being implemented for this Area of Focus are Restorative Practices, Positive Behavior Intervention Systems, Social-Emotional Learning, Equitable Instructional and Grading Practices, and Olweus Bullying Prevention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All interventions are research based and are promoted by our school district. School-based teams receive ongoing training in these interventions, at least annually.

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.

1. The PBIS Team will train new staff on Blanton's PBIS Plan and provide a refresher to returning staff.
2. Teachers will utilize the PBIS Lesson Plans to explicitly teach the expectations to students.
3. MTSS Team will monitor behavior call logs to identify students in need of intervention and/or teachers in need of Tier 1 behavior support.
4. MTSS Team will assign intervention to students and/or teachers in need of support.
5. Increased use of Restorative Practices.
6. Implement district common office discipline referral.

Person Responsible: Cody Piland (pilandc@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#4. 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.

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.

The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency on the 2023 Spring FAST was 41%. The goal for all students achieving ELA proficiency on the 2024 Spring FAST is 60%.

The goal for grade 3 students achieving ELA proficiency on the 2024 Spring FAST is 70%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through involvement by the administrative team and coaches in Curriculum Meetings, SBLT Meetings, and grade level PLCs. It will also occur via walk-throughs and feedback provided by the administrative team, and analysis of formative and summative assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Roth (rothli@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, Corrective feedback, Differentiated instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Explicit instructional practice for scholars: 1) full, clear explanations, 2) teacher modeling, 3) Provide a "worked-out" sample with full teacher explanation, 4) Full guidance during student practice, 5) Teacher corrective feedback. Research demonstrates that direct, explicit instruction is more effective and more efficient than partial guidance. Failure to provide strong instructional support produced measurable loss of learning: minimal guidance can increase the achievement gap. Differentiation consists of the efforts of teachers to respond to variance among learners in the classroom. Teachers will differentiate classroom elements based on student readiness, interest, or learning profile: content, process, products, and learning environment.

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.

1. The number of teachers trained in Flamingo small group instruction will increase by 50%.
2. Implement UFLI Foundations in Kindergarten.
3. Teachers will regularly assess students (informally and formally) and utilize the data to modify their

- instruction and provide targeted, actionable feedback to students within whole and small group settings.
4. ELA Champions will participate in the required trainings and facilitate PLCs with their grade level teams as well as facilitate demonstration lessons with grade level peers for the purpose of studying and ensuring instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.
 5. ELA Coach will teach core reading instruction to a small group of third grade students, daily.
 6. MTSS Coach will teach core writing instruction to small groups of fourth and fifth grade students, daily.
 7. Teachers will foster an environment of cooperation and collaboration among students including academic language, discussions, and group projects.

Person Responsible: Shannen Paetzold (paetzolds@pcsb.org)

By When: Spring 2024

#5. 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.

Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction 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.

The percent of all students achieving Mathematics proficiency on the 2023 Spring FAST was 55%. The goal for all students achieving Mathematics proficiency on the 2024 Spring FAST is 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through involvement by the administrative team and coaches in Curriculum Meetings, SBLT Meetings, and grade level PLCs. It will also occur via walk-throughs and feedback provided by the administrative team, and analysis of formative and summative assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Roth (rothli@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.)

Use and connect mathematical representations, Facilitate meaningful discourse, Pose purposeful questions, Build procedural fluency from conceptual understanding, Support productive struggle in learning mathematics, Elicit and use evidence of student thinking

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective teaching of mathematics engages students in making connections among mathematical representations to deepen understanding of mathematics concepts and procedures and as tools for problem solving. Effective teaching of mathematics facilitates discourse among students to build shared understanding of mathematical ideas by analyzing and comparing student approaches and arguments. Effective teaching of mathematics uses purposeful questions to assess and advance students' reasoning and sense making about important mathematical ideas and relationships. Effective teaching of mathematics builds fluency with procedures on a foundation of conceptual understanding so that students, over time, become skillful in using procedures flexibly as they solve contextual and mathematical problems. Effective teaching of mathematics consistently provides students, individually and collectively, with opportunities and supports to engage in productive struggle as they grapple with mathematical ideas and relationships. Effective teaching of mathematics uses evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward mathematical understanding and to adjust instruction continually in ways that support and extend 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.

1. Teachers will plan purposeful questions based on anticipated student solutions and misconceptions of mathematical concepts.
2. Teachers will regularly assess students (informally and formally) and utilize the data to modify their instruction and provide targeted, actionable feedback to students within whole and small group settings.
3. Teachers will foster an environment of cooperation and collaboration among students including academic language, discussions, and group projects.
4. Students will utilize a mathematician's notebook.

Person Responsible: Erin Macking (mackinge@pcsb.org)

By When: Spring 2024

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged**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.

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of Economically Disadvantaged students achieving ELA proficiency on the 2023 Spring FAST was 32%. The goal for all students achieving ELA proficiency on the 2024 Spring FAST is 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through involvement by the administrative team and coaches in PLCs while planning for standards-based instruction. Student engagement in standards-based instruction will be monitored via walk-throughs and feedback provided by the administrative team. Formative and summative assessment data will be used to monitor students as they move towards proficiency.

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.)

Explicit and direct instruction; multi-sensory approach to all learning; utilize a systematic approach for the delivery of instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Multi-sensory instruction uses visual, auditory, kinesthetic-tactile modalities in acquisition of reading skills. Direct and explicit instruction includes modeling of the skills along with guided practice until mastery is achieved; direct explanations and clearly explained skills comprises 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic**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.

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of Hispanic students achieving ELA proficiency on the 2023 Spring FAST was 35%. The goal for all students achieving ELA proficiency on the 2024 Spring FAST is 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through involvement by the administrative team and coaches in PLCs while planning for standards-based instruction. Student engagement in standards-based instruction will be monitored via walk-throughs and feedback provided by the administrative team. Formative and summative assessment data will be used to monitor students as they move towards proficiency.

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.)

Explicit and direct instruction; multi-sensory approach to all learning; utilize a systematic approach for the delivery of instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Multi-sensory instruction uses visual, auditory, kinesthetic-tactile modalities in acquisition of reading skills. Direct and explicit instruction includes modeling of the skills along with guided practice until mastery is achieved; direct explanations and clearly explained skills comprises 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#8. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**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.

Each teacher plans and delivers lessons that meet the needs of EL students based on English language proficiency levels and length of time in U.S. schools to ensure academic success of each EL in their class.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of English Language Learners achieving ELA proficiency on the 2023 Spring FAST was 35%. The goal for all students achieving ELA proficiency on the 2024 Spring FAST is 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through involvement by the administrative team and coaches in PLCs while planning for standards-based instruction. Student engagement in standards-based instruction will be monitored via walk-throughs and feedback provided by the administrative team. Formative and summative assessment data will be used to monitor students as they move towards proficiency.

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.)

Provide Students the Opportunity to Develop Academic Oral Language While Simultaneously Teaching Literacy and Other Content Areas

Teach Vocabulary Across Content Areas

Provide Instruction and/or Instructional Support in the Primary Language as Needed

Provide Appropriate Interventions for English Learners Who Need Support Beyond Tier 1 Instruction

Implement Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The listed evidence-based practices revolve around academic instruction and represent a summarized list of effective practices from peer-reviewed literature published between 2010 and 2021. Effective and systemic implementation of these research-based and evidence-based strategies leads to improved EL student outcomes.

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.

1. Provide sheltered instruction practices (i.e., comprehensible input and language objectives) to support students in content-area learning.
2. Use peer-supported learning to help students practice oral language during academic lessons.
3. Teach explicit comprehension strategies to assist students in accessing content, while they are developing English proficiency.
4. Provide opportunities for in-depth understanding of words through reading, writing, listening, and speaking.
5. Teach high-utility academic words.
6. Provide instruction with primary-language support when appropriate and as needed - with a strategic withdrawal of this support as students gain language skills.

Person Responsible: Cody Piland (pilandc@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#9. 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.

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of Students With Disabilities achieving ELA proficiency on the 2023 Spring FAST was 11%. The goal for all students achieving ELA proficiency on the 2024 Spring FAST is 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through involvement by the administrative team and coaches in PLCs while planning for standards-based instruction. Student engagement in standards-based instruction will be monitored via walk-throughs and feedback provided by the administrative team. Formative and summative assessment data will be used to monitor students as they move towards proficiency.

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.)

Explicit and direct instruction; multi-sensory approach to all learning; utilize a systematic approach for the delivery of instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Multi-sensory instruction uses visual, auditory, kinesthetic-tactile modalities in acquisition of reading skills. Direct and explicit instruction includes modeling of the skills along with guided practice until mastery is achieved; direct explanations and clearly explained skills comprises 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

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

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

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

Strategically focus on 3-5 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

51% or more of students in grades K, 1, and 2 will be on track to pass the ELA FAST by May 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

60% or more of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will score at a level 3 or higher on the ELA Fast in May 2024.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. More resources will be allocated to teachers and students with the greatest level of need. Academic data will be reviewed and action plans will be made, biweekly, in Learning Communities where the Reading Coach is present and facilitating the learning. Reading Coach will implement coaching cycles. Reading Coach and administrators will provide feedback to teachers in an ongoing, timely manner.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Piland, Cody, pilandc@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Implement UFLI Foundations in grades K and 2

Provide print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction

Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words

Reinforce the effectiveness of instruction in alphabets, fluency, and vocabulary

Provide instruction in broad oral language skills

Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies

Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

To develop literacy, students need instruction in two related sets of skills: foundational reading skills and reading comprehension skills. Employing the evidence-based strategies and action steps will enable students to read words (alphabets), relate those words to their oral language, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency to understand what they read.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Literacy Leadership School Literacy Leadership Teams are meeting monthly to look at data to make informed decisions about what professional learning and supports need to be in place to maximize student growth in reading. Build capacity by identifying teachers, coaches and district staff who can support training in the use of evidence-based curriculum, instruction, and intervention aligned to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. School Literacy Leadership Team will plan family reading nights grounded in family friendly evidence-based practices to support the home to school connection.</p>	<p>Piland, Cody, pilandc@pcsb.org</p>
<p>Literacy Coaching Literacy coach works with school principal to plan and implement consistent professional learning using strategies that demonstrate a significant effect on improving student outcomes. Literacy coach prioritizes time to those teachers, activities, and roles that will have the greatest impact on student achievement in reading, namely coaching, modeling, and mentoring in classrooms daily. Literacy coach supports and train teachers to administer assessments, analyze data and use data to differentiate instruction.</p>	<p>Piland, Cody, pilandc@pcsb.org</p>
<p>Assessment A structure for ongoing formative assessment is in place to determine where instruction should be modified to meet individual student needs. A structure for conducting screening, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessments is in place to identify students with a substantial deficiency in reading.</p>	<p>Piland, Cody, pilandc@pcsb.org</p>
<p>Professional Learning Learning Communities (LCs) are guided by assessment data and are ongoing, engaging, interactive, collaborative, and job-embedded and provide time for teachers to collaborate, research, conduct lesson studies, and plan instruction. School-based teams are provided professional learning sessions on the science of reading and evidence-based literacy instruction, materials, and assessment. School-based teams provide training to teachers that integrate the six components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language, comprehension, and vocabulary) into an explicit, systematic, and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies.</p>	<p>Piland, Cody, pilandc@pcsb.org</p>

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.

Blanton's SIP will be located on the school website (<https://www.pcsb.org/blanton-es>) as well as in the Title I Binder located in the Title I Station in the front office. Information about the SIP and its locations will be provided to all stakeholders during the Title I Annual Meeting.

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))

Blanton's Family Engagement Plan will be made available to all stakeholders on the school's website (<https://www.pcsb.org/domain/10101>) as well as in the Title I Binder located in the Title I Station in the front office. Information about the Family Engagement Plan and its locations will be provided to all stakeholders during the Title I Annual Meeting.

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 plan to strengthen the academic program in our school, increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum via the Extended Learning Program (Promise Time). The Area of Focus addressed is Instructional Practice - ELA.

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))

This plan is developed in coordination and integration with federal programs (Title 1) and local programs (R Club).