

Pinellas County Schools

Starkey 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Starkey Elementary School

9300 86TH AVE, Seminole, FL 33777

<http://www.starkey-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.

100% student success of achieving individual goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will partner with families to inspire a love for learning as students achieve personal goals.

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
Chaffin, Audrey	Principal	The principal performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, safety, budget, purchasing, public relations, plant operations, food service, and transportation. Position is responsible for the total operational management of the school.
Bailey, Debora	Teacher, K-12	The Science SIP Goal Manager is responsible for collaboratively drafting the SIP plan, implementing action steps in PLCs, analyzing and monitoring school wide data, and providing input to modifications needed based on analysis of school wide data.
Terantino, Rachael	Teacher, K-12	The ELA SIP Goal Manager is responsible for collaboratively drafting the SIP plan, implementing action steps in PLCs, analyzing and monitoring school wide data, and providing input to modifications needed based on analysis of school wide data.
Hall, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	As the Positive Culture and Environment SIP Goal Manager, she is responsible for collaboratively drafting the SIP plan, analyzing and monitoring school wide data, coordinating interventions and providing input to modifications needed based on analysis of school wide data.
Wright, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	The Math SIP Goal Manager is responsible for collaboratively drafting the SIP plan, implementing action steps in PLCs, analyzing and monitoring school wide data, and providing input to modifications needed based on analysis of school wide data.
Riddick, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal performs administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, safety and transportation. Position is responsible for meeting with parents to discuss student behaviors and evaluate learning materials and data to determine areas where improvement is needed.

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.

SIP Goal Managers meet with administration to disaggregate data, surveys, and any new district/state requirements. A draft SIP is then created for review and approval. The data is shared with our staff and School Advisory Council along with the proposed goals, action steps and budget. They are provided time at a work session to analyze the information and provide feedback to the draft before the SIP Goal Managers reconvene to finalize the suggestions and input. It is once again shared with our staff and School Advisory Council for final approval. It is then posted on our social media sites and referenced throughout monthly meetings with all stakeholders.

SIP Monitoring

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

Each SIP Goal is overseen by a Goal Manager who has a team of teachers from across all grade levels. SIP Goal Managers meet with administration monthly as a leadership team and then they meet with their teams the following week. All teams meet together in the Media Center, each working in a different area of the room. Time is left at the end of their meetings to share out with the whole group their progress, barriers, needs and next steps. Administration meets regularly with the School Advisory Council and updates the council on progress being made with the SIP toward our goals. Data is shared in a timely manner and feedback is taken back to the SIP Goal Managers and their teams for consideration. A mid-year reflection is conducted by the teams and shared with all as well. Adjustments are made based on data and input to better meet our goals either through increased interventions, enrichment, or tailored professional development.

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	38%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	89%
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	2	23	20	18	18	12	0	0	0	93	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	25	9	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	12	12	0	0	0	25	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	11	14	3	3	5	0	0	0	42	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	1	1	10	6	0	0	0	20

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	1	19	23	17	18	25	0	0	0	103	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	16	10	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	16	15	0	0	0	43	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	7	9	7	4	4	0	0	0	39	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

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	4	0	1	0	0	0	6
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	1	19	23	17	18	25	0	0	0	103	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	16	10	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	16	15	0	0	0	43	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	7	9	7	4	4	0	0	0	39	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

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	4	0	1	0	0	0	6
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*	60	54	53	62	55	56	59		
ELA Learning Gains				69			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			65		
Math Achievement*	70	61	59	67	51	50	64		
Math Learning Gains				68			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			50		
Science Achievement*	74	62	54	72	62	59	70		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	78	64	59	77			72		

** 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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	341
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	507
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	2	
ELL	69			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	63			
MUL	69			
PAC				

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%
WHT	68			
FRL	60			

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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	72			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	46			
HSP	64			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	61			

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	60			70			74					78
SWD	32			27			31				4	
ELL	50			79							3	78
AMI												
ASN	75			88							2	
BLK	31			31							2	
HSP	47			78			83				4	

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
MUL	67			71							2	
PAC												
WHT	63			69			75				4	
FRL	52			62			67				5	67

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	62	69	51	67	68	41	72					77
SWD	25	33		32	48	46						
ELL	64	73		64	82							77
AMI												
ASN	93	91		87	91							80
BLK	33	45		40	64							
HSP	57	61		57	58		69					80
MUL	65	62		65	57							
PAC												
WHT	64	72	54	70	70	55	75					
FRL	57	65	50	63	61	43	65					87

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	59	63	65	64	62	50	70					72
SWD	48			38	70							
ELL	36			40								72
AMI												
ASN	77			85								
BLK	28			33								
HSP	48	80		69	70							
MUL	44			61								
PAC												
WHT	66	63	73	66	64	50	70					

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
FRL	51	62	64	52	51	46	63					62

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	64%	57%	7%	54%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	58%	10%	58%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	53%	5%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	68%	62%	6%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	66%	4%	61%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	67%	61%	6%	55%	12%

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

III. Planning for Improvement**Data Analysis/Reflection**

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

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

58% of students in grade 3 performed at the proficient level on the 2023 ELA FAST PM3. While we outperformed the district and state, we recognize there is room for improvement. Receiving instructional materials in a timelier manner for teachers to better acclimate themselves will allow them to understand the material at a deeper level. This impacted their ability to differentiate material and lessons in a more effective way. In addition, staff stability within the grade level was inconsistent due to illnesses, a maternity leave, and certification issues. Student behaviors within the grade level were more extreme than usual. Student learning suffered due to trauma exposed to, and experienced, at home and school.

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

Upon deeper dissection of the data, we see perspective and point of view is an area that declined compared to the previous year. Teachers' comfort level with the new standards needed to be built so better understanding of task alignment to the assessment could be better gauged. Exposing students to varying lengths of literature would have provided more practice with the standard.

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

The data indicates the greatest gap between Starkey and the state average is Prose and Poetry, specifically perspective and point of view. (There appears to be a deficiency across state and district data as well.) Lack of exposure to Poetry throughout the school year contributes to this gap. Since materials were delayed, teachers could not adequately prepare lessons to be aligned to the assessment.

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

Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary showed the most improvement, notably paraphrasing and summarizing. Grades 3 and 4 improved the most. We believe this is due to intense and continuous scaffolding among the standards through small group instruction in grade 4. In grade 3, teachers planned and implemented lessons which embedded more differentiation, discussion, and active engagement. Use of the student-centered instructional model impacted student success with this component.

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

Potential areas of concern include attendance of those absent 10% or more and students with two or more early warning signs.

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

1. Student-centered instruction
2. Family engagement
3. Student and staff attendance
4. PBIS
5. Teacher retention

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.

65% of students in grades 3 - 5 scored at the proficiency level on the 2022 - 2023 ELA FAST.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of grade 3 - 5 students achieving proficiency level will increase from 65% as measured by the 2022 - 2023 ELA FAST to 70% as measured by the May 2024 ELA FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Administration and SIP Goal managers will meet monthly to monitor progress towards SIP Goals and action steps. Timely data will be shared and analyzed together with school improvement teams and SAC monthly as well.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rachael Terantino (terantinor@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.)

Monitoring for learning and engagement in the ELA block will ensure students are receiving support and guidance in a timely manner. Also, monitoring instruction in both reading and writing will occur more frequently to support teachers with implementing research-based principles accordingly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was based on changes in curriculum and staff. We have to make sure our students are engaged in more rigorous, differentiated literacy tasks with the updated and revised curriculum. These tasks will be aligned to the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards in order to ensure students are making yearly learning gains, while also increasing teacher knowledge of these standards.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Staff will continue to familiarize themselves to gain a deeper understanding of the new B.E.S.T. standards and the proficiency expectations.
2. Revise Starkey Technology Progression Plan "Task/Program" section to reflect real-world application (i.e. typing, word documents, PowerPoint or other presentations platforms). Add new aspects of those programs to each grade level.
3. Monitor for learning and engagement by creating, utilizing, and sharing teacher friendly ways of tracking in the moment learning.

4. Provide strategies and ideas for teachers to use the data tracked to guide instruction.
5. Train staff on available intervention programs and tools, varying small group models, and organization/management routines relating to small group instruction.
6. Participate in "The Joyful Teacher: Strategies for Becoming the Teacher Every Student Deserves" by Berit Gordon book study during PLCs.
7. Train families to use strategies at home through our family involvement activities (i.e. ESOL Night, Literacy Night, and PTA events).

Person Responsible: Rachael Terantino (terantinor@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#2. 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.

71% of students in grades 3 – 5 scored at the proficiency level on the 2022 – 2023 Math FAST.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of grades 3 – 5 students achieving proficiency level will increase from 71% as measured by the 2022 – 2023 Math FAST to 75% as measured by the May 2024 Math FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Administration and SIP Goal Managers will meet monthly to monitor progress towards SIP goals and action steps. Timely data (state assessments, Dreambox lesson completion, unit assessments, formative assessments) will be shared and analyzed together with school improvement teams.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Wright (wrightki@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.)

We will monitor for learning using the McGraw Hill series, Dreambox Learning, and Number Routines as resources to provide rigorous, student-centered instruction daily to include remediation/enrichment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected based on changes in curriculum and staff and therefore calls for increased awareness of monitoring for learning. Students need to be engaged in more rigorous, differentiated tasks that supports standards-based curriculum to ensure more of our students are making on-going learning gains.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Staff will familiarize themselves to gain a deeper understanding of the Florida's B.E.S.T. standards and the proficiency expectations.
2. Provide training to infuse student-centered learning opportunities in lesson planning.
3. Implement goal setting opportunities for students to monitor and revise their goals based on data with celebrations.
4. Provide training to best utilize Flocabulary.com and Building Fact Fluency kits.
5. Participate in Quizizz's district competition in grades 3 - 5.
6. Offer before/after school enrichment programs to support real-world connections.

7. Administration with assess and analyze state assessments, formative assessments, and Dreambox with teachers during regularly scheduled data chats. In turn, teachers will also hold data chats with their students.
8. Host a teacher-led STEM Night during first semester for families.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Wright (wrightki@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#3. 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.

74% of students in grade 5 scored at the proficiency level on the 2022 – 2023 Science SSA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all grade 5 students achieving science proficiency will increase from 74% on the 2022 – 2023 Science SSA to 78% as measured by the 2023 – 2024 Science SSA.

Monitoring:

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

Administration and SIP Goal Managers will meet monthly to monitor progress toward SIP goals and action steps. Timely data will be shared and analyzed together with school improvement teams and SAC monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Debora Bailey (baileydeb@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.)

Effectively monitoring for learning that incorporates the 3- I science instructional routine, nature of science, and vocabulary activities in alignment with grade level standards will ensure students are receiving timely feedback and support to clarify misconceptions early.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on the 2022 – 2023 Science SSA data, Life Science requires continued review. Students need to be engaged in more rigorous, differentiated, hands-on tasks while being monitored for their learning so that more of our students are making on-going learning gains, specifically in this area. Teachers monitoring and intervening will decrease further confusion for the students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Provide ongoing professional development for the 5E instructional model and 3-I science instructional routine (Ignite, Investigate, Inform Instruction).
2. Implement daily 3-I routine using instructional materials to engage in higher level thinking and maximize student learning.
3. Incorporate robotics and academic gaming into the classroom curriculum that includes the Starkey Technology Progression Plan.
4. Incorporate Flocabulary.com, Nearpod, Safari Montage, and school-wide vocabulary resources into

lessons to support the 6M's and science vocabulary.

5. Create school-wide opportunities that enhance science vocabulary usage with real-world relevance.
6. Implement and analyze grade 4 and grade 5 unit assessments to identify lowest scoring standards and adjust lessons accordingly.
7. Host a teacher-led STEM Night during first semester for families.

Person Responsible: Debora Bailey (baileydeb@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Attendance: During the 2022 - 2023 school year, 14% of students were absent 10% or more. Total tardies included were 1534, with 1804 early releases.

Behavior: There were 42 discipline referrals, 12 in school suspensions, and 10 out of school suspensions during the 2022 - 2023 school year.

BTG: 65% of all students in grade 3-5 scored at the proficiency level on the 2022-2023 ELA FAST. 38% of the Black students scored at the proficiency level on the 2022 - 2023 ELA FAST PM3.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Attendance: The attendance rate will decrease from 14% of students absent 10% or more from the 2023 school year to 10% being absent 10% or more during the 2023 school year. The total amount of tardies/early releases will decrease by 10% between May 2023-May 2024, going from 3308 and 2974 respectively.

Behavior: The amount of discipline referrals will be reduced from 42 to 35 during the 2023 - 2024 school year.

BTG: The gap between grade 3-5 students and grade 3-5 Black students achieving proficiency level will be less than 5% on the May 2024 ELA FAST. There were no discipline referrals for Black students during the 2022 - 2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance: The CST team will meet bi-weekly to monitor attendance data and share with applicable stakeholders. Teachers will ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded daily and recorded with the appropriate attendance entry codes.

Behavior: The MTSS team will monitor behavior calls, incident reports, and discipline referrals bi-weekly. Data will be discussed during monthly staff and SAC meetings.

BTG: Administrators will examine changes in teacher practice using the Culturally Relevant classroom walk-through tool four times a year to drive further training and celebrations to acknowledge achievement. Teachers will rate observable Culturally Relevant practices through peer observations and provide meaningful feedback. 6Ms training will be offered throughout the year via school-based and district-based trainings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Hall (hallki@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.)

Attendance: The attendance problem solving process will be strengthened to address and support the needs of students across all tiers on an ongoing basis.

Behavior: A variety of discipline data will be used for decision making to reduce the number of referrals and incident reports. A purposeful process for reviewing and tracking data will be created by the MTSS team. The MTSS Team, SIP Team, and grade level teams will brainstorm and provide teachers with proactive instead of reactive based strategies.

BTG: Teachers will facilitate equity-centered problem solving for the adoption of equitable practices. School based equity centered professional development will be provided to address a mindset shift for the

adoption of equitable practices. Teachers will connect students to academic content through practices that are relevant and responsive and include Restorative Practices into their classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Attendance: Decreasing the percentage of students who are absent 10% or more will lead to higher student achievement.

Behavior: By providing proactive strategies to staff the number of discipline referrals will decrease by 7.

BTG: This strategy will promote equity within the classroom culture, lessons, and resources by providing teachers the opportunity to create lessons using a cultural lens. By providing professional development, we should see a reduction in the achievement gaps between various subgroups.

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.

Attendance:

1. Provide attendance recordkeeping training to staff during the first month of school during school-wide PLC.
2. Implement attendance recognition with Bear Paws/Paw Points, Paws-itive referrals, Starkey Store, and assemblies.
3. CST will monitor and share attendance progress with applicable stakeholders bi-weekly.

Behavior:

1. Provide staff with materials and activities to foster teacher and peer relationships.
2. Implement positive behavior recognition with Bear Paws/Paw Points, STAR Classroom Celebration, Paws-itive referrals, Starkey Store, and assemblies.
3. Reiterate PBIS expectations on an on-going basis with all students and staff. Teachers will implement the provided Establishing Expectation lessons plans.

BTG:

1. Conduct weekly restorative "Bear Huddles" using Harmony kit.
2. Continued training for teachers on Restorative Circles/Conversations.
3. Prioritize student subgroups with timely, specific, actionable feedback with opportunities for application.
4. Student subgroups will receive a minimum of 2 - 4 Paws-itive referrals during 2023-2024 school year.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Hall (hallki@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.

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.

Our SIP is available in the front office at our Title I Station. A copy of our SIP One-pager will be discussed at parent meetings including Open House, Curriculum Night(s), Title I Annual Meeting, and SAC meetings. Teachers will utilize their time during parent conferences to raise awareness of our SIP goals. Administration will send a robo call and an email to families encouraging them to review the SIP at their convenience using our school website: <https://www.pcsb.org/starkey-es>

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))

In order to build positive relationships with all involved in our school's mission we will review survey data to provide high-interest parent trainings. Teachers, staff, and parents will frequently analyze data to celebrate positive gains and facilitate open communication for suggestions to continue being on a positive track forward. Teachers, parents, and our School Advisory Council will collaborate throughout the year for opportunities that supports the curriculum and builds strong relationships within the school.

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)

In order to strengthen the academic program with emphasis on enhanced curriculum, teachers will utilize informal observations of peers, students' formal assessments to tailor instruction, cross grade level data analysis meetings, and collaborative planning during PLCs. Students will become fluent in their ability to have commentary with peers, give actionable feedback, and have a platform to identify and then articulate their observations and connections to the learning. This will further support our ELA and Math SIP action steps of student-centered learning. Parents, other staff members, and stakeholders are able to participate in academic excursions that include field trips, speaking engagements, and curriculum nights related to the classroom content.

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

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A