

Pinellas County Schools

Eisenhower 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Eisenhower Elementary School

2800 DREW ST, Clearwater, FL 33759

<http://www.eisenhower-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.

Eisenhower Elementary achieves success by increasing opportunities for all scholars by providing a respectful community with high expectations and student centered instruction in order to prepare all students for college and career readiness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Growing tomorrow's leaders today.

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
Baker, Tijuana	Principal	
Hasson, Laura	Assistant Principal	
Painter, Sarah	Instructional Coach	
Quillen, Amy	Instructional Coach	

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 new Principal involved stakeholders in the development of the school improvement plan to make more informed decisions. One-on-one chats with staff members and meetings with key teacher leaders and school-based leadership team allowed for open discussions. The new principal also met with district personnel as well as the former principal to gain a broader understanding of the improvement needs of the school.

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))

1 School Advisory Team- This committee will meet monthly to discuss progress, challenges, and potential revisions to the plan.

2. Grade Level and Department Data Chats: Regularly collect and analyze data on student achievement, including test scores, formative assessments, and other relevant data points. Use this data to identify areas of improvement and to track progress over time.
3. Classroom observations and walkthroughs: Conduct regular classroom observations to assess the implementation of instructional strategies and interventions outlined in the School Improvement plan. Provide feedback to teachers and identify areas where additional support or modifications may be needed.
4. Student progress monitoring: Implement a system for tracking individual student progress, particularly for those students who are part of the achievement gap. This can include regular check-ins, progress reports, and targeted interventions to address specific needs.
5. Parent and community involvement: Engage parents and the wider community in the monitoring process. Encourage their participation in regular meetings, surveys, and feedback sessions to gather their perspectives on the effectiveness of the School Improvement plan.
6. Ongoing professional development: Provide regular professional development opportunities for teachers to ensure they have the knowledge and skills necessary to implement the strategies outlined in the plan. This can include workshops, training sessions, and peer collaborations.
7. Collaboration and communication: Foster a culture of collaboration and open communication among staff members. Encourage regular meetings and discussions to share best practices, challenges, and potential revisions to the plan.
8. Continuous improvement cycles: Establish regular review cycles to assess the effectiveness of the School Improvement plan. Use the data collected and feedback received to identify areas for improvement and make necessary revisions to the plan.
9. Stakeholder feedback: Seek feedback from students, parents, staff, and community members on the impact of the School Improvement plan. Conduct surveys, focus groups, or town hall meetings to gather their perspectives and incorporate their suggestions into the plan.
10. External evaluations: Consider involving external evaluators or consultants to conduct periodic evaluations of the School Improvement plan. Their independent assessments can provide valuable insights and recommendations for improvement.

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	73%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification	N/A

*updated as of 3/11/2024	
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	38	24	42	33	27	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	32	36	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	30	26	0	0	0	60
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	2	0	3	19	12	0	0	0	36

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	1	5	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	4

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	26	30	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	25	30	0	0	0	77
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	0

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	26	30	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	25	30	0	0	0	77
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	0

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

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

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

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*	42	54	53	46	55	56	40		
ELA Learning Gains				58			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			41		
Math Achievement*	56	61	59	60	51	50	50		
Math Learning Gains				67			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			33		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	50	62	54	42	62	59	47		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	64	59	61			58		

* 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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	255
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
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	29	Yes	1	1
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP	47			
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	51			
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	42			56			50					61
SWD	20			38			17				5	43
ELL	29			54			37				5	61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			43			25				4	
HSP	36			55			45				5	60
MUL	82			82							2	
PAC												
WHT	58			65			68				4	
FRL	38			54			47				5	63

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	46	58	44	60	67	63	42					61
SWD	20	48	40	39	72	75	14					46
ELL	36	49	30	56	66	53	33					61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	56	58	52	71	65	32					
HSP	42	54	35	59	64	59	39					59
MUL	44	36		56	55							
PAC												
WHT	66	73		67	70		60					80
FRL	45	58	40	61	69	61	42					59

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	40	47	41	50	53	33	47					58
SWD	23	20		19	30							52
ELL	34	43	33	52	56	36	36					58

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	25	44		30	31		33					
HSP	38	46	38	55	60	28	43					56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54	50		53	57		71					
FRL	39	48	40	49	54	32	48					57

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	44%	57%	-13%	54%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	58%	-19%	58%	-19%
03	2023 - Spring	40%	53%	-13%	50%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	54%	62%	-8%	59%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	66%	2%	61%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	61%	-13%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	60%	-14%	51%	-5%

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.

ELA proficiency showed the lowest performance.

- lack of intentional planning
- lack of intervention groups, within classrooms, with fidelity
- lack of understanding appropriate interventions to match specific skill deficits

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

ELA and Math proficiency dropped two percentages points. Contributing factors are lack of intentional planning and awareness of appropriate interventions to match scholar needs.

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.

ELA proficiency

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

5th grade Science increased by 4% points. New actions taken were making science hands on and giving scholars opportunities to experience science in real life applications. More labs were conducted, as well as reading science text during the ELA block.

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

ELA proficiency. Scholars absent 10% or more of the school year.

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

1. ELA/ Math/Writing/Science Proficiency
2. Positive Behavior Supports and Climate
3. Third Grade Proficiency

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 Collaborative Planning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The data from the FAST assessment for the 2022-2023 academic year suggests that some scholars are not performing proficiently at their grade level in ELA, Math, and Science. Upon analyzing the data, it appears that the inconsistent collaborative planning within grade level teams and insufficient quality of interventions may be contributing to this issue. These collaborative planning sessions and interventions are meant to address the gaps in academic learning that hinder scholars' comprehension, ability to analyze and synthesize text, use vocabulary effectively, and understand scientific concepts and mathematical principles. Additionally, the balance of time dedicated to collaborative systems, monitoring and providing feedback to scholars during core instruction seems to be inadequate.

This conclusion is supported by the number of scholars who are performing below level three or above in their respective subjects and the lack of evidence of consistent collaborative planning sessions with teams. It is clear that there is a need for targeted and effective collaborative planning and interventions to support these scholars in reaching their grade level expectations. It is crucial to ensure that all scholars receive sufficient support and guidance during core instruction, while actively engaging in grade-level tasks in ELA, math, and science.

Addressing these issues will require a comprehensive approach that includes consistent and high-quality collaborative planning and interventions, as well as improved monitoring and feedback practices. By implementing these changes, we can expect to see an improvement in scholars' academic performance and their ability to meet grade-level expectations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency in ELA will increase by 10% from 44% to 54%

Proficiency in Math will increase by 10% from 58% to 68%

Proficiency in Science will increase by 10% from 46% to 56%

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by regular data collection and progress monitoring of ELA, Math and Science PLC's. Additionally, classroom observations, feedback from teachers and staff, and student and parent surveys will be used to monitor progress. Various formal and informal assessments will be conducted to determine whether the implemented strategies are effective in achieving the desired outcome and make any necessary adjustments or improvements.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tijuana Baker (bakerti@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.)

Create a culture of collaboration by establishing demonstration/model classrooms at each grade level where ELA teachers learn from and inspire one another.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Professional development that includes opportunities for collaboration and reflection improves the impact of training in startling ways. Teachers who participate in professional learning methodologies that promote collaboration and offer them opportunities for reflection apply what they learned nearly 90% of the time (Joyce and Showers). The world's top performing school systems enable teachers to work together and learn from one another while planning lessons jointly and observing each other teaching. Professional development needs to be intensive and ongoing because the process of improving teaching and learning is not often smooth or instantly successful. Peer coaches work with colleagues by modeling or coteaching a lesson and reflect afterward to discuss what worked and what could be improved. This is part of the long-term process of continual improvement. This in-class professional development is a hallmark of effective professional learning, allowing teachers to put knowledge into action.

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.

- Recruit/retain a strong ELA Champion at each grade level
- Cultivate a trusting and motivating culture where curiosity, improvement, & risk-taking are valued
- Leaders and teachers attend ELA Champion meetings 3 x a year and partner to collaborate and focus on strengthening practices to support implementation of B.E.S.T. Standards and ELA curriculum aligned to the standards.
- ELA Champions support others in implementing new curriculum materials to maximize impact on student learning.
- Utilize district model classroom support documents when planning & facilitating classroom visits.
- Regularly collaborate as a Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) to engage in meaningful discussions and collective goal-setting around improving literacy outcomes for students including, but not limited to teacher support and community outreach.

Person Responsible: Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#2. 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 current data indicates that during the 2022-23 school the school reported significant risk ratio for African American males. Additionally, staff reports of student elopement frequency contributed to the disruption of the orderly operation of the school and negatively impacted school culture and safety of the environment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the guidance of PBIS early warning indicators, our objective is to decrease the risk ratio of black scholars from 6.64 to 3.3 as part of our school improvement plan. We have identified an issue of incomplete data, pointing towards potential inconsistent student referral processing.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through the creation of the School Wide Behavior Plan that includes a referral process that includes behavior response flow chart that indicates when and why an office referral should be written. All referrals once handled by administration will be entered by the DMT.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Hasson (hassonl@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.)

PBIS Tracking System, It is an evidence-based framework used by schools to improve school culture and student behavior, promoting a safe environment for learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The multi-device platform makes it easy to continuously recognize students for meeting behavior expectations from anywhere in the school, not just the classroom. And with the added features like referral tracking. Check-in/Check-out, and a teacher rewards system, PBIS Rewards will help foster accountability and fidelity in our PBIS system.

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.

Utilize Tier 2 Behavior Referral Form consistently to track and monitor student needs.

Utilize PCS Common Office discipline referral and ensure that data is entered is entered into focus in a timely manner.

Person Responsible: Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Utilize Behavior Specialist and Behavior Technician to provide effective behavior strategy modeling to increase student teacher relationships that encourage students to stay in class.

Person Responsible: Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

By When: 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.

2022-23 FAST Data indicates that our African American scholars are performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and science. Our data analysis indicates this is evident by inconsistent opportunities in task aligned to grade level standards with monitoring and feedback.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase our black scholar's proficiency by at least 10% in ELA, Math and Science as measured by the FAST Assessment in ELA, Math and the NGSSS Assessment in Science.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through, PMP's written for black scholars, data chats with administration, and classroom push in and small group observation and walkthrough data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tijuana Baker (bakerti@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.)

Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the Federal Index trend data our African American scholars are performing above the Federal Index. In order to keep performing above the index we must implement and monitor specific strategies in ELA, Math and Science.

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.

AVID: Academic Preparedness will help scholars to develop academic skills that will allow them to successfully complete rigorous curriculum and experiences.

Person Responsible: Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

AVID: Give scholars research opportunities, allow them to set goals, help them make choices that support their long-term aspirations and successfully navigate transitions through academic and behavior demands in ELA, Math and Science.

Person Responsible: Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Develop student literacy buddies where proficient black students in ELA, Math and Science can provide guidance and support to younger black students. This program will be aimed at targeting motivation, self-esteem, and academic engagement among black students who show social emotional and academic gaps.

Person Responsible: Christen Perlman (perlmanc@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Monitor and Analyze Data: Regularly collect and analyze data on black student achievement in math, ELA and science to identify areas of improvement and adjust strategies accordingly. This data-driven approach can help identify trends, measure progress, and inform decision making.

Person Responsible: Sarah Painter (painters@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

2022-2023 FAST Data indicates that our scholars with disabilities are performing below grade level in ELA, Math and Science. ELA-----% proficient, Math --% proficient, and Science --% proficient. Our data analysis indicates that this is evident by inconsistency in scheduling, attendance and opportunities in task aligned to grade level standards while meeting IEP Goals.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our plan is to increase our scholars with disabilities proficiency by at least 10% in ELA, Math and Science as measured by the FAST Assessment in ELA, Math and Science NGSSS. Ensure a weekly balance between IEP Goals minutes and exposure to grade level standards and tasks with appropriate scaffolds.

Monitoring:

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

Area of focus will be monitored through IEP meetings and schedule fidelity. IEP progress reports, data chats with administration, and alternative teaching model observations and walkthrough data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tijuana Baker (bakerti@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 alternative teaching models pushed into the classroom and curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards aligned, rigorous expectations for identified scholars with disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

2023 FAST Data indicates that our scholars with disabilities are showing the expected grade level proficiency at a lower level than our other 7 subgroups. The Federal Index 2023 was -----% only -----% above the Federal Index of 41%.

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.

AVID: Use inquiry based, collaborative strategies to challenge and engage scholars in content resulting in increasingly comple levels of understanding. (Model, Design, and Guide)

Person Responsible: Tijuana Baker (bakerti@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Make strategic schedule development about the implementation of the curriculum in ELA, Math and Science to maximize impact on student learning that include alternative scheduling models:

Teaming

Station Teaching

Parallel Teaching

Alternative Teaching

(Within the classroom vs. Pull out Instruction)

Person Responsible: Tijuana Baker (bakerti@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.

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

We will 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

We will concentrate on 3-5 teachers and instruction in order to drive faster improvements by utilizing resources as equitably as possible, including instructional assistance, school-based professional development, coaching cycles, 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

Increase our K-2 scholar's progress towards passing ELA statewide assessment using coordinated screening and progress monitoring by at least 10% in ELA.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Increase our 3-5 scholar's proficiency by 10% from 44% to 54% on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored by regular data collection and progress monitoring of ELA, Math and Science PLC's. Additionally, classroom observations, feedback from teachers and staff, and student and parent surveys will be used to monitor progress. Various formal and informal assessments will be conducted to determine whether the implemented strategies are effective in achieving the desired outcome and make any necessary adjustments or improvements.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Baker, Tijuana, bakerti@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
-------------	-----------------------------------

Literacy Leadership

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.

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.

Baker, Tijuana,
bakerti@pcsb.org

School Literacy Leadership Team plan family reading nights grounded in family friendly evidence-based practices to support the homeschool connection.

Literacy Coaching

Literacy coach will work with school principals 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.

Quillen, Amy,
quillena@pcsb.org

Literacy coach supports and trains teachers to administer assessments, analyze data and use data to differentiate instruction.

Assessment

Develop a structure for ongoing formative assessment to determine where instruction should be modified to meet individual student needs.

Baker, Tijuana,
bakerti@pcsb.org

Determine a structure for conducting screening, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessments to identify students with a substantial deficiency in reading.

Professional learning

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.

School-based teams are providing professional learning sessions on the science of reading and evidence-based literacy instruction, materials, and assessment.

Baker, Tijuana,
bakerti@pcsb.org

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.

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.

Visual Presentation: Create visually appealing presentation of the SIP in one page to convey the key points of the SIP. This One Pager SIP will be shared in weekly updates emailed to parents. One Pagers will be visible in every classroom.

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))

Community Outreach Programs: Engage in community outreach programs, such as partnerships with local organizations or service projects, to emphasize the importance of social responsibility and civic engagement. this involvement strengthens the school's ties with the broader community.

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)

Offering regular professional development opportunities to teacher in areas of focus for enhancing their teaching skills and knowledge. The school will organize workshops, training sessions, and conferences to equip teachers with innovative teaching strategies, instructional technologies, and subject specific knowledge. This will enable teachers to deliver a high-quality education and implement an enriched and accelerated 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))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
---	--------	---	--------

2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes