

Pinellas County Schools

Curlew Creek 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 | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 21 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Curlew Creek Elementary School

3030 CURLEW RD, Palm Harbor, FL 34684

<http://www.curlew-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 Curlew Creek Elementary is to be responsive to the academic, emotional, social, and individual needs of each child. Our goal is to develop thinkers and problem solvers who are ready to be responsible, confident, and productive members of a diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: 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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Brickley, Kathleen | Principal | School Improvement Leader |
| Schneider, Katrina | Assistant Principal | School Improvement Leader |
| Brooks, Michelle | Teacher, K-12 | School Improvement Leader of ELA School Improvement Plan writer |
| Clendaniel, Deena | Teacher, K-12 | School Improvement Leader of Gifted and Talented School Improvement Plan writer |
| Avolt, Dawn | Teacher, K-12 | School Improvement Leader of Mathematics School Improvement Plan writer |
| Cocio, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12 | School Improvement Leader of Science School Improvement Plan writer |
| White, Karina | Teacher, K-12 | School Improvement Leader of PBIS |

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.

We utilize our school leadership team and SAC comprised of school staff to include support staff, instructional staff, parents, and community members. We analyze STAR/FAST progress monitoring cycle data and other data relevant to our goal areas. We also discuss/monitor current goals and action steps, discuss best practices and determine the best steps in goal setting and actions to create a draft plan. After a draft plan is created, goals and action steps are adjusted based on feedback from our stakeholders prior to finalizing the plan.

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))

A Professional Learning Plan is developed in alignment with the SIP as our roadmap. The SIP is reviewed after each of our district assessment cycles to analyze student performance trends in meeting our goals. We also review sections of our SIP during monthly school improvement team meetings and grade level PLC's. Through the work of our MTSS/SBLT, CST, Team Leaders, and PLCs we progress monitor our student subgroups focusing on those with the largest achievement gaps to determine if interventions are having a positive impact on student learning and if the achievement gap is closing and then make changes accordingly. A mid-year reflection and a 90 -day action plan are also developed and implemented to address any identified deficiencies. Revisions are made to the 90-day action plan as needed. Potential revisions to the SIP are reviewed following each district assessment cycle.

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 | 32% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 44% |
| 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: A |

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| | 2018-19: A 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 | 0 | 25 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 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 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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 | 2 | 27 | 15 | 21 | 16 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 18 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 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 | 2 | 27 | 15 | 21 | 16 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 18 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 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* | 57 | 54 | 53 | 64 | 55 | 56 | 63 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 66 | | | 65 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 60 | | | 43 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 69 | 61 | 59 | 68 | 51 | 50 | 67 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 71 | | | 83 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 49 | | | 79 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 68 | 62 | 54 | 65 | 62 | 59 | 71 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 65 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 52 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 57 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 53 | 64 | 59 | 68 | | | 78 | | |

* 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 | 59 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 297 |
| 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 | 64 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 511 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| 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 | 32 | Yes | 2 | |
| ELL | 44 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 55 | | | |
| MUL | 68 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | | | |

| 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% |
| FRL | 50 | | | |

| 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 | 30 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| ELL | 60 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 60 | | | |
| HSP | 56 | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | | | |
| FRL | 56 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 57 | | | 69 | | | 68 | | | | | 53 |
| SWD | 29 | | | 34 | | | 33 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 11 | | | 68 | | | | | | | 3 | 53 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | | | 41 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| HSP | 49 | | | 68 | | | 63 | | | | 4 | |
| MUL | 64 | | | 71 | | | | | | | 2 | |

| 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 |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | | | 72 | | | 67 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 46 | | | 58 | | | 51 | | | | 5 | 50 |

| 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 | 64 | 66 | 60 | 68 | 71 | 49 | 65 | | | | | 68 |
| SWD | 27 | 37 | 33 | 29 | 41 | 27 | 17 | | | | | |
| ELL | 43 | 65 | | 57 | 65 | | | | | | | 68 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 41 | 64 | | 53 | 82 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 58 | 40 | 63 | 67 | 42 | 67 | | | | | 50 |
| MUL | 55 | | | 45 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | 69 | 67 | 72 | 72 | 48 | 62 | | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 64 | 60 | 51 | 63 | 50 | 56 | | | | | 50 |

| 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 | 63 | 65 | 43 | 67 | 83 | 79 | 71 | | | | | 78 |
| SWD | 40 | | | 40 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 26 | | | 37 | | | | | | | | 78 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 79 | | | 71 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 58 | 62 | | 58 | 85 | | 71 | | | | | |
| MUL | 47 | | | 60 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 67 | 43 | 71 | 87 | 93 | 75 | | | | | |
| FRL | 55 | 54 | | 56 | 70 | 70 | 57 | | | | | 82 |

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 | 61% | 57% | 4% | 54% | 7% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 73% | 58% | 15% | 58% | 15% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 53% | 53% | 0% | 50% | 3% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 62% | 2% | 59% | 5% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 73% | 66% | 7% | 61% | 12% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 86% | 61% | 25% | 55% | 31% |

| 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.

Our overall ELA achievement showed the lowest performance. Third grade was our lowest performing grade with 53% of students meeting or exceeding expectations. This is the group of students who experienced the COVID pandemic when they were in kindergarten. Students missed core face to face instruction for part of their kindergarten year and much of their first-grade year. In addition, our black subgroup is showing a downward trend this year.

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

Our overall ELA achievement showed a decline of 4 points from 64% to 60%. Third grade was our lowest performing grade with 53% of students meeting or exceeding expectations. This is the group of students who experienced the COVID pandemic when they were in kindergarten. Students missed core face to face instruction for part of their kindergarten year and many students for their entire first grade year. We have diverse learning needs within third grade, including a high ESE subgroup. Although students showed growth across this school year, we continue to struggle with closing this gap.

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.

Our school exceeded the district and state achievement levels in ELA and Math and Science. In ELA, the state level was 54% and Curlew Creek was 60%. In Mathematics, the state level was 58% and Curlew Creek was 71%. In Science, the state level was 51% and Curlew Creek was at a 68% achievement level. Our achievement levels consistently exceed state levels.

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

Our overall math achievement showed the most improvement with 68% last year and 71% this year. This same group of students came into fifth-grade with 63% meeting/exceeding fourth-grade expectations. An increased focus occurred in mathematics as our fifth-grade teachers departmentalized and provided extended learning programs before/after school and during lunch. This resulted in an 86% proficiency level in fifth-grade math.

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

Absenteeism is an area of concern in our early warning indicators. Our child study team will focus on this area and will develop a school-wide tiered program for communicating the importance of regular attendance and rewarding attendance. We do have self-contained Access Point classes with students that have medical needs with high absence rates.

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

1. Overall ELA achievement level
2. Third grade ELA achievement level
3. Black ELA achievement level
4. ESE achievement level
5. Attendance

Area of Focus

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

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

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

Instructional practices specifically related to monitoring whole group and small group instruction that is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency in Math will increase from 71% to 80% as measured by the PM3 FAST Assessment.
 Proficiency in ELA will increase from 60% to 75% as measured by the PM3 FAST Assessment.
 Proficiency in Science will increase from 68% to 75% as measured by the State Science Assessment.
 Black student proficiency will increase from 28% to 50% as measured by the PM3 FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Using a district tool, students will be progress monitored three times a year to assess proficiency in Math, ELA and Science. Ongoing assessments - unit assessments, teacher observation, formative assessments, and analysis of student's work will inform instruction in all content areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@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.)

In order to maintain our focus on implementing evidence-based principles we will focus our Professional Learning Community work on the following strategies: explicit and systematic instruction, scaffolding instruction, giving corrective feedback with opportunities to make corrections, and providing differentiation to our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Explicit instructional practice for students learning new content:

- 1) full, clear explanations
- 2) teacher modeling
- 3) provide a "worked out" sample with full teacher explanation
- 4) teacher corrective feedback

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.

Teachers and administrators implement and facilitate a goal setting environment where students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals, monitor academic progress, revise goals based on data, and celebrate success.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Implement a plan to identify students who are not meeting grade level benchmarks. Use data to develop and implement plans to support students through targeted instruction, differentiated instruction, and adapting content/product/process/resources. Progress will be monitored regularly, and adjustments will be made with a focus on closing gaps.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Actively participate in the Math and Science Teacher Leadership Institute (MAST) as a school team to engage in professional development and conversations with other schools around the common goal of developing strategic school-based teams, partnering with administrators to enhance school culture and student learning outcomes in math and science.

Person Responsible: Dawn Avolt (avoltd@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Deliver explicit, step-by-step instruction in multiple, briskly paced cycles related to students interests and cultural backgrounds. Provide opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback ensuring ample time is given to read and write appropriate grade-level text (while applying foundational skills) with high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Continue participation in the Javitz School-wide Differentiation Project:

1. Cluster group gifted and talented students so the process of engaging students in complex, differentiated tasks occurs easily and frequently.
2. Strengthen teacher practice to utilize questioning strategies to encourage and enhance higher order thinking.
3. Invite gifted department staff developer onto campus to facilitate PD around gifted pedagogy and teaching critical memory that is good for all learners.

Person Responsible: Deena Clendaniel (clendanield@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.

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To reinforce behaviors and expectations, a positive reward system is in place that includes classroom and schoolwide recognitions. Curlew Creek Elementary School started using a PBIS Online Reward system to track and monitor student behavior and reinforcement of appropriate behaviors.

Monitoring:

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

We will be looking at grade level specific behavior and location to identify trends and increases in recognition of appropriate behaviors. (Guidelines for Success)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katrina Schneider (schneiderk@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.)

Our interventions will be restorative practices and PBIS. These are research and evidence-based programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A multi-faceted approach to building a positive school culture and environment includes a positive behavior support system, use of Restorative Practices with an equity mindset, and attendance monitoring and support.

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. Identify the expected behaviors (Guidelines for Success),
2. Teach, model and practice what those behaviors look like, sound like, and feel like,
3. Specifically praise appropriate behavior with private or public acknowledgement, and
4. Measure outcome data to determine successes and barriers to reaching the desired goals.

Person Responsible: Katrina Schneider (schneiderk@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#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.

Students with disabilities increased ELA proficiency from 25% to 28% on the PM3 FAST Assessment. We need to continue our focus on ELA proficiency with this subgroup.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with disabilities will increase ELA proficiency from 28% to 50% as measured by the PM3 FAST Assessment 3 and FSAA 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring cycles will be used to assess proficiency in ELA throughout the school year. Case managers and classroom teachers will also utilize ongoing assessments such as unit assessments, teacher observation, formative assessments, and analysis of student work to identify appropriate IEP goals and develop specially designed instruction for ESE students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katrina Schneider (schneiderk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Explicit and direct instruction; multi-sensory approach to all learning; Teachtown curriculum for Access Students; utilize a systematic approach for the delivery of instruction; collaboration; communication

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Multi-sensory instruction uses visual, auditory, kinesthetic-tactile modalities in acquisition of reading skills. Direct and explicit instruction includes modeling of the skills along with guided practice until mastery is achieved; direct explanations and clearly explained skills comprises explicit instruction; teachers are clear, unambiguous, direct and visible—until students meet mastery. Systematic instruction includes breaking lessons into sequential and manageable steps that go from simple to complex skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Case managers will identify student gaps in learning based on current assessment data. They will use this information to determine the appropriate service delivery model for each student. Teachers will use evidence-based practices to teach foundational literacy skills needed to close gaps in learning.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Provide opportunities for ESE and general education teachers to collaborate and co-plan for differentiation and specially designed instruction.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Monitor teaching and learning for best practices including individual or small group instruction, multi-sensory learning, explicit and direct instruction, carryover of therapy strategies (OT, PT, Speech and Language), and social/emotional learning.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Provide multiple opportunities for students to engage in and respond to instruction using their primary mode of communication, which may include the use of augmentative or alternative communication systems or visual supports and other prompts to support student success with communicating what they are learning/have learned.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Brickley (brickleyk@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 process to review our school improvement funding allocations goes through our school advisory council (SAC), and school improvement leaders. Data and need rationale are presented to SAC for approval to utilize funds for instructional resources to support student needs..