Sunset Hills Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sunset Hills Elementary School

1347 GULF RD, Tarpon Springs, FL 34689

http://www.sunsethills-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.

The Mission of Sunset Hills Elementary School is to provide a caring environment where families, students and staff learn together to ensure all students are prepared for college, career and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide a collaborative and equitable learning environment ensuring 100% student success.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Abrahamson, Darren	School Counselor	
Bone, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Craig, Dautie	Teacher, K-12	
Crawford III, Johnnie	Principal	
Vargus, Karen	Assistant Principal	
Lindquist, Donna	Teacher, K-12	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The principal invited staff members to help develop the SIP plan. The group that helped to develop the plan included: primary teachers, intermediate teachers, guidance counselors, and administration. The administration also used the input of community members (parents, students, families), SAC members, PTA members, and stakeholder survey to guide the plan development.

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

The SIP will be monitored by the SIP planning committee, SAC, PLC, and SBLT. The administration will gather feedback from each of these meetings and use the feedback to revise the plan as necessary to ensure continuous 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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	3	3	10	13	10	14	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
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	15	16	7	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	9	4	0	0	0	26
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	4	12	20	25	21	0	0	0	82

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	22	20	24	24	30	23	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	17	4	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	18	6	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	14	13	20	18	0	0	0	69

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	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	22	20	24	24	30	23	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	17	4	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	18	6	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	14	13	20	18	0	0	0	69

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	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	68	55	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				79			70		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				69			43		
Math Achievement*	65	61	59	75	51	50	70		
Math Learning Gains				85			86		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			71		
Science Achievement*	81	62	54	84	62	59	75		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		64	59	80					

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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	266
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	603
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	33	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	58			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	61			

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	67			
ELL	80			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	72			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	69			

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			65			81					
SWD	31			47							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	59			48			60				4	
MUL	52			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	60			68			87				4	
FRL	52			62			75				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	68	79	69	75	85	63	84					80
SWD	43	82	85	43	76	73						
ELL												80
AMI												
ASN												

	2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2020-21**	**C & C Accel 2020-21**	**ELP Progress**
BLK	30			50								
HSP	65	73		70	81							
MUL	58	70		91								
PAC												
WHT	71	83	80	76	87	64	84					
FRL	57	71	68	68	82	67	71					

	2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2019-20**	**C & C Accel 2019-20**	**ELP Progress**
All Students	68	70	43	70	86	71	75					
SWD	19	45		35	70		25					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	70			83			60					
MUL	85			67								
PAC												
WHT	67	69		69	87	80	77					
FRL	58	62		59	76	70	63					

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	69%	57%	12%	54%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	58%	-2%	58%	-2%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	59%	53%	6%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	59%	62%	-3%	59%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	66%	-2%	61%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	78%	61%	17%	55%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	80%	60%	20%	51%	29%

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.

4th grade ELA at 56% proficient. In 2021-2022 4th grade was at 68% proficient. 4th grade had a high number of students absent throughout the year and multiple early warning indicators. In addition, student behavior issues were chronic throughout all classrooms and students. 2 out of 3 teachers in 4th grade were new to 4th grade. Florida adopted BEST standards for ELA and Math, in addition to Pinellas County adopting new math and ELA curriculum simultaneously. Furthermore, the assessment students took was completely different from the previous year.

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

4th grade ELA (68% to 56%) and 4th grade math (76% to 64%). 2 out of 3 teachers in 4th grade were new to 4th grade. Florida adopted BEST standards for ELA and Math, in addition to Pinellas County adopting new math and ELA curriculum simultaneously. 4th grade had a high number of students absent throughout the year and multiple early warning indicators. In addition, student behavior issues were chronic throughout all classrooms and students. Furthermore, the assessment students took was completely different from the previous year. However, when reviewing cohort data, this group of students came in lower (56% proficiency in ELA, 61% proficiency in Math). This shows a minor growth in math and stagnate growth in ELA.

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.

5th grade math was well above the state proficiency rate (78% versus 55%). Historically, 5th grade has been strong in math. Additionally, the 5th grade team has been consistent since 2019.

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

3rd grade ELA showed the most improvement (56% to 63%). 3rd grade student count was low in comparison to other grade levels. The 3rd grade team was restructured (3 out of 5). Two of the new team members were from upper grades and 1 was from primary. This gave the team a knowledge base from multiple grade level perspectives.

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

Attendance.

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

1. Improve student attendance
2. Increase 3rd and 4th grade ELA proficiency
3. Improve the implementation of PBIS across all grade levels

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST data SHES shows a critical need to move students scoring a 1 or 2 in ELA (85 students). Based on classroom observations, teachers need to increase higher level questioning and giving specific feedback. Additionally, according to FAST data, all grade levels need improvement in informational text and vocabulary.

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

SHES will decrease the number of students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the state assessment by 10% in ELA and increase higher level questioning and specific feedback for all students. Additionally, we will increase student knowledge in informational text and vocabulary. This will result in an overall proficiency from 61% to 71% as measured by the PM3 FAST data.

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

All content areas will be monitored by using formative (exit tickets and PLC), interim (iStation ISIP, Module assessments, and FAST PM1/PM2), and summative assessments (FAST PM3). Additionally, informal observations of questioning and feedback will be used for monitoring.

Grade 3 ELA proficiency will increase from 58% to 70% as measured by the PM3 FAST.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johnnie Crawford III (crawfordjo@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.)

SHE will continue implementing the new B.E.S.T. standards, have data discussions in professional learning communities (PLC), and use intentional professional development based on the needs of the teacher and students.

PLC's will determine areas of most need according to the ISIP and FAST assessment in order to plan learning targets by using explicit instruction and scaffolding for targeted students. Teachers will plan interventions based on student need according to assessment data.

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

For students who did not score a level 1 or 2 on the FAST assessment, tier 1 instruction needs to be differentiated based on the area the students are not experiencing success. Additional resources and strategies such as scaffolding, small group instruction, and peer assistance will be implemented. We believe if we implement these interventions with fidelity, we will decrease the number of students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the state assessment by 10% in ELA.

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

All content areas will be monitored by using

1. Formative (exit tickets and PLC)
2. Informal observations of higher level questioning and specific feedback to teachers to increase the rigor of questioning in the classroom
3. Interim (iStation ISIP, Module assessments, and FAST PM1/PM2)
4. Summative assessments (FAST PM3).
5. Collaborative plannings across grade levels to share innovative methods to utilize higher order questioning and engagement in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Karen Vargus (vargusk@pcsb.org)

By When: Formative: daily, ongoing Interim: every 4 weeks at Module end, ISIP monthly, PM1 (September), PM2 (December) Summative: PM3 occurs in May 2024

#2. 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.

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST scores, 38% of African American students were proficient in ELA, 38% of student were proficient in Math, and 50% of students were proficient in Science.

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

African American students scoring proficient in ELA will increase by 32% on the summative state assessment for the school year 2023-2024.

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

School, grade level, and class level data will be monitored throughout the school year for African American students in the areas of grades, attendance, and formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johnnie Crawford III (crawfordjo@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.)

SHES will use student data trackers to assist African American students in knowing their learning targets and progress during the year for ELA, Math and Science.

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

Student involvement in instructional progress is key to ownership and engagement. Students will have a data tracker to keep track of their formative assessments. During data conferences, students will make goals for ELA, Math and Science to compare their progress to their goals throughout the school year.

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.

Administration will create or adjust the student data tracker. Teachers will assist students in filling out their data trackers throughout the year. The student data trackers will also be used during student lead conferences.

Person Responsible: Karen Vargus (vargusk@pcsb.org)

By When: Data tracker will be utilized starting with completion of first module. (Math/ELA/Science). Conferences will be held with students as each module concludes.

#3. 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.

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST scores, 32% of students with disabilities were proficient in ELA, 57% of student were proficient in Math, and 70% of students were proficient in Science.

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

Students with disabilities scoring proficient in ELA will increase by 38% on the summative state assessment for the school year 2023-2024 and students with disabilities scoring proficient in Math will increase by 13% on the summative state assessment for the school year 2023-2024.

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

School, grade level, and class level data will be monitored throughout the school year for Students with Disabilities in the areas of grades, attendance, and formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johnnie Crawford III (crawfordjo@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.)

SHES will use student data trackers to assist Students with Disabilities in knowing their learning targets and progress during the year for ELA, Math and Science.

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

Student involvement in instructional progress is key to ownership and engagement. Students will have a data tracker to keep track of their formative assessments. During data conferences, students will make goals for ELA, Math and Science to compare their progress to their goals throughout the school year.

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.

Administration will create or adjust the student data tracker. Teachers will assist students in filling out their data trackers throughout the year. The student data trackers will also be used during student lead conferences.

Person Responsible: Karen Vargus (vargusk@pcsb.org)

By When: Data tracker will be utilized starting with completion of first module. (Math/ELA/Science). Conferences will be held with students as each module concludes.

#4. 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.

The building, and subsequent maintenance of a positive school culture and environment requires the planning ahead, effective implementation, and consistent effort by stakeholders within the school, and engagement of our parents and community outside our school.

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

As a neighborhood school, we value the continuing support and involvement of our community as measured by attendance and participation of school, community events and extracurricular activities. We will increase the number of participants by 10% by May 1, 2024.

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

Attendance will be monitored by issuing tickets or taking roll at each event/activity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darren Abrahamson (abrahamsonda@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.)

Black students will receive personal invitations to attend school, community events and participate in extracurricular clubs. Financial barriers will be assessed and mitigated as needed.

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

Connectedness is paramount to increasing student achievements, by removing financial or social obstacles we will increase participation by 10%.

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.

Develop calendar of events in conjunction with PTA. Establish extracurricular activities and inform students and parents. Promote through a variety of media. Follow up by documenting attendance and participation. Ensure staff is aware of students who may have obstacles.

Person Responsible: Darren Abrahamson (abrahamsonda@pcsb.org)

By When: May 1, 2024

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST data SHES shows a need to move students scoring a 1 or 2 in Math (73 students). Based on classroom observations, teachers need to increase students understanding of number sense in grades 3-5. Specifically, 3rd grade needs to focus on Multiplicative reasoning (17% proficiency), 4th grade needs to focus on operations with whole numbers (36% proficiency), and 5th grade needs to focus on fraction and decimal operations (55% proficiency).

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

SHES will decrease the number of students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the state assessment by 8% in Math. This will result in an overall proficiency from 67% to 75% as measured by the PM3 FAST data.

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

All content areas will be monitored by using formative (exit tickets and PLC), interim (Unit assessments, and FAST PM1/PM2), and summative assessments (FAST PM3).

.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johnnie Crawford III (crawfordjo@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.)

SHE will continue implementing the new B.E.S.T. standards, have data discussions in professional learning communities (PLC), and use intentional professional development based on the needs of the teacher and students.

PLC's will determine areas of most need according to the Unit assessments, Benchmark assessments, and PM1 and PM2 FAST assessment in order to plan learning targets by using explicit instruction and scaffolding for targeted students. Teachers will plan interventions based on student need according to assessment data.

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

For students who did not score a level 1 or 2 on the FAST assessment, tier 1 instruction needs to be differentiated based on the area the students are not experiencing success. Additional resources and strategies such as scaffolding, targeted small group instruction, and peer assistance will be implemented. We believe if we implement these interventions with fidelity, we will decrease the number of students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the state assessment by 8% in Math.

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 content areas will be monitored by using

1. Formative (exit tickets and PLC)
2. Interim (Unit assessments, Benchmark assessments, and FAST PM1/PM2)
3. Summative assessments (FAST PM3).
4. Collaborative plannings across grade levels to share different methodology of teaching mathematical skills.

Person Responsible: Karen Vargus (vargusk@pcsb.org)

By When: Formative: daily, ongoing Interim: every 4 weeks at Module end, ISIP monthly, PM1 (September), PM2 (December) Summative: PM3 occurs in May 2024

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

Based on the 2022-2023 SSA data SHES shows a need to move students scoring a 1 or 2 in Science (12 out of 62 students). According to SSA data, 5th grade students show the greatest area of concern to be the earth science strand.

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

SHES will decrease the number of students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the state assessment by 5% in Science and spiral review Earth science content throughout the year. This will result in an overall proficiency from 80% to 85% as measured by the SSA data.

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

All content areas will be monitored by using formative (exit tickets and PLC), interim (Unit Assessments, 3rd and 4th grade Diagnostic Assessments), and summative assessments (Cycle Assessments and Mock SSA).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johnnie Crawford III (crawfordjo@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.)

SHE will continue implementing the NGSSS, have data discussions in professional learning communities (PLC), and use intentional professional development based on the needs of the teacher and students.

PLC's will determine areas of most need according to the Unit and Cycle assessment in order to plan learning targets by using explicit instruction and scaffolding for targeted students. Teachers will plan interventions based on student need according to assessment data.

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

For students who did not score a level 1 or 2 on the Science Standards assessment, tier 1 instruction needs to be differentiated based on the area the students are not experiencing success. Additional resources and strategies such as cross curriculum teaching, scaffolding, and small group instruction will be implemented. We believe if we implement these interventions with fidelity, we will decrease the number of students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the state assessment by 5% in 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.

All content areas will be monitored by using

1. Formative (exit tickets and PLC)
2. Spiral Reviewing Earth science standards throughout the school year
3. Interim (Diagnostic assessments, Unit assessments, Mock SSA)
4. Summative assessments (Cycle Assessments and Science Standards Assessment).
5. Collaborative plannings across grade levels to share innovative methods to utilize Earth Science standards.
6. Utilize individual IStation science assignments to reinforce previously taught science standards.

Person Responsible: Karen Vargus (vargusk@pcsb.org)

By When: Formative: daily, ongoing Interim: at the end of the Unit assessment, Cycle assessment, and Diagnostic assessment period Summative: SSA occurs in 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).

Students are identified for additional support based on their 2022-23 school data as well progress monitoring and PM1-PM3 data collected during the 2023-24 school year. These students are given a priority invitation to extended learning or after school tutoring. Opportunities to participate in extracurricular activities and other after school events are available and encouraged.