
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	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Tarpon Springs Fundamental Ele

400 E HARRISON ST, Tarpon Springs, FL 34689

<http://www.tarponfund-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.

In collaboration with families, we will provide a safe, nurturing environment which inspires lifelong learning and fosters responsible citizenship.

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
Price, Teresa	Principal	

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.

The principal presented the current data to the SAC committee and the entire faculty. All participating stakeholders shared ideas and concerns which were collected on chart paper. The SIP plan was adjusted accordingly.

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 SIP will be presented at the first PTA meeting and updates at 2 subsequent meetings during the year. As the school gains further insights and receives data to analyze, the leadership team will make adjustments as needed to the SIP Plan.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	31%
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)	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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	2	0	3	1	6	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	12

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

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

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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				2	1	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions				0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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.				2	2	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	10

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	2	1	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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.	2	2	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	10

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	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*	87	54	53	91	55	56	89		
ELA Learning Gains				77			85		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				76			80		
Math Achievement*	95	61	59	94	51	50	93		
Math Learning Gains				76			75		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				71			50		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	92	62	54	79	62	59	92		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		64	59						

* 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	89
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	81
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	564
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	70			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	64			
HSP	100			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	91			
FRL	83			

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	85			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	82			
FRL	77			

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	87			95			92					
SWD	60			80							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			82							2	
HSP	100			100							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	88			95			92				4	
FRL	73			93			90				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	91	77	76	94	76	71	79					
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	94	73		100	73							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	92	81	83	94	75	64	82					
FRL	87	69	80	92	79	60	71					

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	89	85	80	93	75	50	92					
SWD												
ELL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	90			100								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	92	89		94	76		94					
FRL	81	81		89	69		93					

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	92%	57%	35%	54%	38%
04	2023 - Spring	91%	58%	33%	58%	33%
03	2023 - Spring	83%	53%	30%	50%	33%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	96%	62%	34%	59%	37%
04	2023 - Spring	91%	66%	25%	61%	30%
05	2023 - Spring	98%	61%	37%	55%	43%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	91%	60%	31%	51%	40%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Based on the 22-23 FAST Data the following had the lowest performance: 1st and 3rd grade ELA. Last year the third-grade curriculum was new as well as progress monitoring assessment. Teachers are not yet prepared to differentiate within core instruction.

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

Based on the 21-22 and 22-23 state assessment data our 3rd to 4th grade co-hort declined by 9% in math and 4th grade from year to year declined by 6%. The teachers rotate based on the size of the grade level. We only team teach in 5th grade.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Based on the 22-23 state assessment data all grades and subjects are significantly above the state average.

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

Based on the 22-23 state assessment data, 5th grade math improved by 12%. New math curriculum was implemented. Our students are getting a good foundation in early learning.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data one area of concern is the number of students scoring level 1 and level 2 on both ELA and Math.

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

Increase ELA proficiency in 3rd grade to 90%.

Reduce the number of students achieving level 2 in ELA from 8 students to 0 students.

Reduce the number of students achieving level 1 in ELA from 4 students to 0 students.

Increase 4th grade math proficiency to 94%.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the 22-23 state assessment data, 3rd grade students did not achieve at the same level as other grades at the school. 3rd graders had 82% proficiency as compared to 4th grade at 91% and 5th grade at 92%.

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.

For the 23-24 school year, 90% of 3rd grade students will be proficient on the ELA state assessment, 92% of 4th grade will be proficient and 93% of 5th grade will be proficient on the ELA state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The students will be monitored by the FAST PM1 and PM2 assessments as well as iStation, district module assessments and other classroom assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Teresa Price (pricete@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 instructional practice for students when learning new content, skill or concepts will include full, clear, explanations, teacher modeling, exemplars, full guidance during practice, and provide teacher corrective feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Decades of research clearly demonstrate students direct, explicit instruction is more effective and more efficient than partial guidance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The school will provide professional development opportunities for high level questioning and student engagement.

Person Responsible: Ashley Lloyd (lloyda@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Students will track their own progress in mastering standards and skills.

Person Responsible: Ashley Lloyd (lloyda@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Teachers will use small group instruction and differentiation to meet students' individual needs.

Person Responsible: Laura Snare (snarel@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

After reviewing the data from the 22-23 school year, the school will focus on reducing the number of students achieving Level 1 or Level 2 in ELA, Math. Based on the data the majority of students are scoring well above level 3.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the Early Warning System data and the FAST Data, the school will focus on reducing the number of Level 1, 3rd grade students in ELA from 2 to 0, Level 1, 3rd grade students from 1 to 0, Level 1 4th grade students in ELA from 2 to 0 and Level 1, 4th grade students in Math from 2 to 0 and Level 2, 3rd grade students in ELA from 7 to 0, Level 2, 3rd grade students from 1 to 0, Level 1 4th grade students in ELA from 1 to 0 and Level 1, 4th grade students in Math from 3 to 0 and Level 2, Science from 9 to 0.

Monitoring:

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

The school will monitor student progress with the PM1, PM2, iStation, Dreambox and module assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Teresa Price (pricete@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 school will use science of reading interventions, iStation, Dreambox and small group instruction to move students out of level 1 or 2.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The research behind the science of reading is clear and we have experienced success with all of the above mentioned interventions.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The school will provide the opportunity for professional development in the science of reading and the new ELA curriculum and standards. The leadership team will meet with PLC's to determine individual plans for students who were a level 1 or 2 in reading or math. The leadership team and the teacher will monitor student success and adjust evidence based practices as needed.

Person Responsible: Ashley Lloyd (lloyda@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Students will be involved in monitoring their own progress on the mastery of the standards.

Person Responsible: Ashley Lloyd (lloyd@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Schoolwide PLC's will monitor student success, plan differentiation for core instruction and adjust instruction according to data.

Person Responsible: Ashley Lloyd (lloyd@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#3. 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.

Based on the 22-23 FAST assessment, 4th grade math percent proficient dropped 9% as a co-hort and 7% year over year. This grade level is also 5% lower than 3rd grade and 7% lower than 5th grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the achievement of other grade levels, 4th grade math will increase proficiency from 91% to 94%.

Monitoring:

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

The school will monitor the area of focus with PM1, PM2, iStation and Dreambox data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Teresa Price (pricete@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 school will use PSC math shuffle power points during warm-up, and intervention, Dream Box for independent practice and small group instruction to increase proficiency in 4th grade and increase high level questioning and elevated math tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategies have been used and have been successful with other grade levels.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The use of quality math tasks and high level questioning will be implemented in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Ashley Lloyd (lloyda@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Small group instruction will be used for both enrichment and intervention in all K-5 classrooms.

Person Responsible: Ashley Lloyd (lloyda@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Teachers will be provided additional planning time to research and develop high quality questions and math tasks.

Person Responsible: Ashley Lloyd (lloyda@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the 22-23 FSSA scores, Tarpon Springs Fundamental Elementary will increase the number of students scoring a level 3,4, and 5.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of students scoring a level 1 in science will be 0 and the number of students scoring a level 2 will be less than 5. We will increase the number of students scoring a level 5 by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

The students will be monitored by formative assessments and benchmark assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Lloyd (lloyd@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will use the curriculum provided by the district and increase the use of academic vocabulary and incorporate project-based learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The school will use the curriculum that was designed by the district to teach the standards and connect science academic vocabulary across curriculum to because it is researched based and has been successful with past students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

All grade levels will participate in the district science showcase.

Person Responsible: Ashley Lloyd (lloyd@pcsb.org)

By When: April 2024

The school will participate in science vocabulary building through and interactive bulletin board that will be displayed in a common hallway. All students will be encouraged in participating in the activity.

Person Responsible: Ashley Lloyd (lloyd@pcsb.org)

By When: April 2024

Enrichment opportunities that are inquiry based will be made available for students who master the standards quickly.

Person Responsible: Ashley Lloyd (lloyda@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#5. 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.

After reviewing the current PBIS guidelines for success and systems in place, it was determined that they made need to be revisited based on attendance and inconsistencies with infractions for not following fundamental policies.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student achievement will increase, and infraction data will decrease and become more consistent across grades levels and teachers.

Monitoring:

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

Outcomes will be measured by infraction data, absenteeism data, and behavior data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Snare (snarel@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.)

Revamp the PBIS system and students will participate in their own data tracking.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implementation of school-wide positive behavior support leads to increased academic engaged time and enhanced academic outcomes (Algozzine & Algozzine, 2007; Horner et al., 2009; Lassen, Steele, & Sailor, 2006)

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.

Form committees to review the current PBIS plan, make suggested changes, seek school and community feedback, develop new plan and implement it.

Person Responsible: Laura Snare (snarel@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Develop and implement student data trackers for academic, attendance and behavior.

Person Responsible: Laura Snare (snarel@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

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