

Pinellas County Schools

# San Jose Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## San Jose Elementary School

1670 SAN HELEN DR, Dunedin, FL 34698

<http://www.sanjose-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 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
Brown, Lisa	Principal	The Principal is the instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes, through the hiring, development, support, supervision and retention of high-quality instructional and support staff. As the school leader, the Principal creates a culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families through collaboration and distributive leadership. In alignment with the Florida Principal Standards, the Principal leads the school team to increased school and student outcomes by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing the operational, safety, and policy responsibilities of a school-building leader.
Wignall, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is an instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes through staff development and effectiveness. In collaboration with and aligned to the direction of the Principal, the Assistant Principal supports the creation of the culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families throughout the school community. In alignment with the Florida Assistant Principal Standards, the Assistant Principal supports and leads assigned school teams to increased school and student outcomes through ongoing training, coaching, feedback and support by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing operational, safety and policy responsibilities, as assigned.

#### 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 process for involving stakeholders includes the school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, and community members. Team leaders meet monthly to analyze data, review and revise school improvement goals and collaborate to intentionally plan effective strategies for the school improvement plan. Team leaders implement this process with their teams and bring team member school improvement planning input to monthly meetings. The School Advisory Council meets monthly to

review school improvement data, discuss school improvement goals and strategies, and provide school improvement plan input. The San Jose School Advisory Council includes all required stakeholders.

### SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Improvement Plan is regularly monitored through monthly team leader meetings and monthly SAC meetings. A mid-year SIP review, update and revision is conducted in January, following an analysis of the cycle 2 assessment results. Subgroup data and individual student data is reviewed and analyzed monthly with teachers during bi-monthly preprofessional learning communities to ensure continuous improvement for each student and subgroup.

### Demographic Data

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	32%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	93%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

### 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	12	13	16	6	6	0	0	0	53	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	6	7	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	8	
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	0	3	1	3	5	1	0	0	0	13

**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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

#### **Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	19	12	8	7	9	0	0	0	55	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	5

**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	

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	19	12	8	7	9	0	0	0	55	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	5

**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*	59	54	53	59	55	56	61		
ELA Learning Gains				56			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			36		
Math Achievement*	75	61	59	66	51	50	63		
Math Learning Gains				62			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				77					
Science Achievement*	79	62	54	35	62	59	60		
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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	266
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	401
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
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	46			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	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%
SWD	41			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	56			

### 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	59			75			79					
SWD	36			55							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	44			63							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	64			78			95				4	
FRL	51			65			70				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	59	56	46	66	62	77	35					
SWD	26	50		33	55							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	50		31								
HSP	44	45		67	82							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	72	60		76	71		50					
FRL	55	54		63	62		46					

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	61	52	36	63	58		60					
SWD	43	50		50	69		57					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			44								
HSP	50			50								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	70	56		72	64		70					
FRL	55	52		61	57		52					

### 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	65%	57%	8%	54%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	58%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	46%	53%	-7%	50%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	71%	62%	9%	59%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	66%	10%	61%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	61%	12%	55%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	60%	10%	51%	19%

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

English Language Arts FAST proficiency level in grade 3 showed the lowest performance at 48% proficiency. The 3rd grade class enrollment was higher than the suggested teacher pupil ratio with over 20 students in each class. High teacher pupil ratio prevented a high rate of differentiated and individual instruction.

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

Proficiency levels for English Language Arts and Mathematics and Science increased from the prior year.

**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.**

All data components were above the state average.

English Language Arts: 60% proficient

Math 77% proficient

Science 79% proficient

**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 proficiency with an increase of 19%. School leaders and teacher leaders participated in the new professional development initiative. Math and Science Teacher Institute (MAST) and utilized the learning in this training to intentionally plan and implement strategies aligned to math and science state standards.

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

The EWS data indicates a need for improvement in reducing the students absent more than 10% on grades 1-3. EWS data indicates 41 students in grades 1-3 were absent more than 10%.

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

- Increase proficiency in Math, Science and English Language Arts
- Increase learning gains in Math, Science and English Language Arts
- Increase learning gains for the lowest 25% in Math, Science and English Language Arts
- Increase the Positive Culture and Climate resulting in reduced discipline incidents.
- Increase family and Community involvement.

**Area of Focus**

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

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

Benchmark-based data (FAST, formative assessments, etc.) collected from the 2022-2023 school year indicated proficiency levels of 60% on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking for English Language Arts, 77% on the Florida Assessment for Student Thinking for Mathematics and 79% on the Florida State Science Standards Assessment. Students need to be provided with increased consistent tasks aligned to grade level appropriate standards. Proficiency will increase with consistent opportunities for student to be successful with standards-aligned tasks. Teachers need increased effective teaching methods to support learning.

**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 English Language Arts proficiency will increase from 60% to 65% as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking for English Language Arts. The percent of all students achieving Mathematics proficiency will increase from 77% to 80% as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking for Mathematics. Our 2023 level of performance was 79% proficient as evidenced by the 2023 Florida State Science Standards Assessment. We expect our science proficiency level to be 80% by May of 2024.

**Monitoring:**

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

Monitoring by administrators will occur by leaders partnering with teachers attending ELA, math and science professional development sessions. Administrators will attend site based, grade level Professional Leadership Communities to support collaborative planning. Follow up monitoring will occur through classroom visits followed by actionable feedback and collaborative data analysis.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lisa Brown (brownlisa@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.)

Utilize district curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students. Intentionally plan and implement whole and small group instruction according to evidenced based principles.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Reduced proficiency is occurring because of the need for students to be provided with increased consistent tasks aligned to grade level appropriate standards. Proficiency will increase with consistent opportunities for students to be successful with standards-aligned tasks. Teachers need increased effective teaching methods to support learning for proficiency to increase.

**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.

Implement structures for collaborative planning in professional learning communities where teachers regularly engage in analysis of data and student work to guide intentional planning of cross curricular instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Lisa Brown (brownlisa@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023- May 2024

Employ instructional practices and routines that promote student-centered learning (Higher-Order Questioning, Pinellas Problem Solving Routine, Play-Explore-Investigate (PEI), Number Sense Routines).

**Person Responsible:** Lisa Brown (brownlisa@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023- May 2024

Actively participate in the Math and Science Teacher Leadership Institute as a school team to engage in professional development to enhance school culture and student learning outcomes in mathematics and science.

**Person Responsible:** Stephanie Wignall (wignalls@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023- May 2024

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English language supports, as well as more advanced texts for students above the benchmark. Supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as data driven small-group instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Lisa Brown (brownlisa@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023-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.

Positive Culture and Climate goals, actions and strategies will increase student attendance at school and decrease student discipline referrals which will result in higher student engagement in learning.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The number of students receiving referrals will decrease from 25 students to 15 students, as evidenced by School Profiles discipline data. The percent of students missing 10% or more days of school will decrease from 30% to 15% as evidenced by School Profiles data.

**Monitoring:**

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

Monitoring by administrators will occur by leaders partnering with staff to participate in professional development sessions with a focus on PBIS, Culture and Climate and Restorative Practices. Administrators, PBIS coordinator and Restorative Practices trainer will facilitate site based, professional collaborative planning and dialog. Follow up monitoring will occur through school walkthroughs followed by actional feedback and collaborative data analysis.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Stephanie Wignall (wignalls@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.)

Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strong positive relationships engage students in the process of learning resulting in reduced discipline incidents.

**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.

All staff will receive training on how to teach classroom rules and procedures using restorative circles and use of impromptu conversations. Staff will proactively review rules and expectations with students.

**Person Responsible:** Lisa Brown (brownlisa@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023

The Restorative Practices trainer will provide resources and modeling on how to incorporate use of affective language when providing positive praise and corrective feedback.

**Person Responsible:** Lisa Brown (brownlisa@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023-May 2024

Utilize a system of recognition to provide rewards to students for demonstration of positive and appropriate behaviors that are identified in the schoolwide expectations. 100% of school members will participate in the reward system and the rewards will be varied and reflect student interests.

**Person Responsible:** Stephanie Wignall (wignalls@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023-May 2024

Orient students, staff and families to the Schoolwide Positive Behavior System and conditions for learning.

**Person Responsible:** Lisa Brown (brownlisa@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023

Each day, classroom teachers will greet and welcome students using trust generated actions, building rapport and strong relationships.

**Person Responsible:** Lisa Brown (brownlisa@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023-May 2024

Analyze and monitor discipline data and plan necessary strategies at monthly PBS meetings.

**Person Responsible:** Stephanie Wignall (wignalls@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023-May 2024

Analyze and monitor discipline data and plan necessary strategies at monthly PBS meetings.

**Person Responsible:** Lisa Brown (brownlisa@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023

Classroom teachers will regularly conduct class meetings/community building circles that reflect the schoolwide expectations.

**Person Responsible:** Lisa Brown (brownlisa@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023-May 2024

Intentionally build positive relationships with families and community through activities designed to build respect and trust between home and school. Classroom teachers make regular positive calls home.

**Person Responsible:** Stephanie Wignall (wignalls@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023-May 2024

Strengthen the problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all Tiers on an ongoing basis as related to school attendance.

**Person Responsible:** Stephanie Wignall (wignalls@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023-May 2024

**#3. 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.

Our 2022 level of performance is 37% of black students were proficient as evidenced in the 2022 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking English Language Arts. We expect our performance level to be increased to 62% of black students will be proficient as measured the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking by May of 2023 and 2024 (2023 ESSA data not available- July 2023).

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The percent of black students increasing proficiency will increase from 37% to 62% as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking by May 2023 and 2024 (2023 ESSA data not available- July 2023).

**Monitoring:**

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

Monitoring will be done by school administrators, district leaders and instructional staff developers. Administrators will attend site based, grade level Professional Leadership Communities to support collaborative planning with a focus on effective practices. Follow up monitoring will occur through classroom visits using the walkthrough tool to observe practices, target growth areas and provide actionable feedback related to highly engaging strategies for diverse learners and data analysis.

**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.)

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

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.

Provide Professional Development on Specially Designed Instruction

**Person Responsible:** Stephanie Wignall (wignalls@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023-May 2024

Monitor the use of appropriate practices and scaffolding to ensure students' needs are met.

**Person Responsible:** Lisa Brown (brownlisa@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023- 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.

**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**

Utilize 3-5 curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.

### 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

The percent of all students achieving English Language Arts proficiency will be 65% as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking for English Language Arts.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percent of all students achieving English Language Arts proficiency in Grade 3 will increase from 50% to 65% as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking for English Language Arts. The percent of all students achieving English Language Arts proficiency in will increase from 60% to 65% as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking for English Language Arts.

## 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.

Monitoring by administrators will occur by leaders partnering with teachers attending ELA, math and science professional development sessions. Administrators will attend site based, grade level Professional Leadership Communities to support collaborative planning. Follow up monitoring will occur through classroom visits followed by actionable feedback and collaborative data analysis.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brown, Lisa, [brownlisa@pcsb.org](mailto:brownlisa@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?

- o Provide print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction
- o Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words
- o Reinforce the effectiveness of instruction in alphabets, fluency, and vocabulary
- o Provide instruction in broad oral language skills
- o Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies
- o 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 coaches work with school administrators with a focus on grade 3 to plan and implement consistent professional learning using strategies that demonstrate a significant effect on improving student outcomes.</p> <p>? Literacy coaches prioritize time in grade 3 with a focus on differentiated groups within the core instruction.</p>	Wignall, Stephanie, wignalls@pcsb.org
<p>Literacy Leadership</p> <p>? School Literacy Leadership Teams are meeting regularly 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.</p> <p>? 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.</p> <p>? School Literacy Leadership Team plan family reading nights grounded in family friendly evidence-based practices to support the homeschool connection</p>	Brown, Lisa, brownlisa@pcsb.org
<p>o Professional learning</p> <p>? Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) 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.</p> <p>? School-based teams are provided professional learning sessions on the science of reading and evidence-based literacy instruction, materials, and assessment.</p> <p>? 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>	Wignall, Stephanie, wignalls@pcsb.org
<p>o Assessment</p> <p>? Develop a structure for ongoing formative assessment is in place to determine where instruction should be modified to meet individual student needs</p> <p>Determine a structure for conducting screening, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessments is in place to identify students with a substantial deficiency in reading.</p>	Wignall, Stephanie, wignalls@pcsb.org

## 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.



The SAC provides input, revises and approves the school improvement plan. The school improvement plan is posted on the school website, presented at the Annual Title 1 meeting and is located in the Parent Resource Center in the school office. At each monthly SAC meeting, a different section of the school improvement plan is analyzed by the school advisory council members, SAC meetings are advertised monthly through the school website, parent emails, phone calls home to all families and through social media.

**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))

The school will engage students and families in attendance related activities to ensure that they are knowledgeable of the importance of school engagement and attendance. In addition, the school will utilize social media, School Messenger, school website, family engagement events, family conferences, compacts and student planners to increase parent communication and engagement.

**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)**

Utilize district curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students. Intentionally plan and implement whole and small group instruction according to evidenced based principles. (Area of Focus #1). Highly qualified, reading endorsed, hourly teachers provide supplemental, differentiated small group instruction to close the proficiency gap and enhance classroom instruction. Instructional materials are provided to students to implement AVID strategies across the curriculum.

**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))**

The school district and school collaborate with the Early Childhood Coalition to coordinate efforts to ensure school readiness for students. In addition, a partnership with Feeding Tampa Bay (local organization) provides an onsite food pantry for the school community. School administrators meet quarterly with the City of Dunedin commission and community organizations to coordinate efforts for supporting the needs of the school.