

Pinellas County Schools

Lake St. George 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	28
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Lake St. George Elementary School

2855 COUNTY ROAD 95, Palm Harbor, FL 34684

<https://www.pcsb.org/lakestgeorge-es>

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.

Preparing today's children for tomorrow's world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Lake St. George Elementary school is 100% student engagement and success 100% of the time.

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
Wolcott, Monika	Principal	
Ovalle, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Dyer, Terri	School Counselor	
Boyd, Corey	Behavior Specialist	

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 writers, listed above, meet during preschool with team leaders to revise and review what was created using school data.

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 on a monthly basis to ensure effective implementation and to ensure there is an increase in student achievement in all content areas. The school leadership team and staff will meet to look at school data in all content areas and revise action steps as needed to show 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	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	42%
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: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	15	13	13	15	20	0	0	0	77	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	5	11	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	5	5	0	0	0	12	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	5	6	3	3	3	0	0	0	27	

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	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	5

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	3	0	0	0	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	0	20	17	22	23	22	0	0	0	104	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	14	5	0	0	0	29	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	8	8	0	0	0	24	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	1	2	2	5	8	0	0	0	21	

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	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	0	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) Updated (pre-populated)

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	20	17	22	23	22	0	0	0	104	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	14	5	0	0	0	29	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	8	8	0	0	0	24	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	1	2	2	5	8	0	0	0	21	

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	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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*	69	54	53	68	55	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				62			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			20		
Math Achievement*	77	61	59	76	51	50	72		
Math Learning Gains				63			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			32		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	59	62	54	70	62	59	69		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	59	64	59	85			70		

* 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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	338
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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	529
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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	69			
HSP	56			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	73			
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	47			
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	68			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	57			

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	69			77			59					59
SWD	31			57			20				4	
ELL	42			53							3	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	64			73							2	
HSP	56			63							4	38
MUL	67			80							2	
PAC												
WHT	72			80			66				4	
FRL	61			69			56				5	46

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	62	56	76	63	49	70					85
SWD	43	47		57	35		55					
ELL	25			56								85
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40											
HSP	58	50		74	61		73					93
MUL	75			58								
PAC												
WHT	70	61	61	78	66	52	69					
FRL	54	58	47	60	59	40	65					75

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	57	20	72	56	32	69					70
SWD	57	50		49	46		38					
ELL	64			73								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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	50			58								
MUL	77			75								
PAC												
WHT	68	56	13	74	55	36	67					
FRL	65	50	27	58	59	40	63					69

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	76%	58%	18%	58%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	53%	18%	50%	21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	81%	62%	19%	59%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	66%	16%	61%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	77%	61%	16%	55%	22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	59%	60%	-1%	51%	8%

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.

Science showed the lowest percentage of students meeting proficiency. We are currently dissecting the data to get a better understanding of the low performance. Some early indicators are: When looking at 5th grade cohort data, the scores are trending at or near the previous year(s) data. The master schedule had science first thing in the morning, which would impact tardy students.

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

Science showed the greatest decline compared to the previous year. We are currently dissecting the data to get a better understanding of the low performance. Some early indicators are: When looking at 5th grade cohort data, the scores are trending at or near the previous year(s) data. The master schedule had science first thing in the morning, which would impact tardy students.

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.

Science had the greatest gap in all content areas in comparison to the state. We are currently dissecting the data to get a better understanding of the low performance. Some early indicators are: When looking at 5th grade cohort data, the scores are trending at or near the previous year(s) data. The master schedule had science first thing in the morning, which would impact tardy students.

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

Math had the greatest improvement with an overall 5% increase. This year we invited a math staff developer on campus to help teachers gain a better understanding of the new curriculum. The staff received professional development to dissect data and we created academic plans to ensure our students were going to be proficient.

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

Attendance is an area of concern for Lake St. George. We have a large number of students with tardies and or attendance issues.

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

Reading Proficiency in 3rd grade
Science
Attendance
Learning Gains
Writing

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Eliminate the gap between the proficiency rates in reading (ELA) and mathematics for black and non-black students. Current data indicates the gap between our black students and our non-black students was 31% in ELA and 36% in Math. The problem/gap is occurring because the depth of knowledge of standards and the varying use of high yield engagement strategies by teachers is not evident or seen regularly or used with fidelity. The Instructional Practice will focus on supporting teachers understanding and usage of research-based practices.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease the gap by at least 5% in ELA and Math as measured by the new state assessment between black and non-black students.

Monitoring:

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

Student, teacher, grade and school data: classwork, teacher-made assessments, district assessments and walkthrough observation data focused on standards-based and target/task specific to black vs. non-black student achievement. Administration will monitor professional development and implementation of Restorative, Culturally Relevant teaching and high yield engagement strategies for teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@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.)

Implement the 6 M's of culturally relevant teaching. (Meaning, Models, Monitoring, Mouth, Movement, and Music). Ensure black students are participating in extended learning opportunities before and after school. Ensure SEL and Restorative practices are in place to support students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If the implementation of the 6M's, SEL, and Restorative practices are being used with fidelity, the gap between black and non-black students would be minimized or eliminated.

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 and support on implementing 6M's in instruction, SEL, and Restorative Practices.
2. Support teachers in lesson planning of 6M's.

3. Ensure black students are in ELP.
4. Regularly monitor lesson plans and professional development of teachers and staff

Person Responsible: Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#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.

Cultivating a supportive environment to support the needs of all stakeholders by creating consistent and predictable environments where expectations are explicit so that the whole school community knows how to be

successful. Our black students will be matched with a trusted adult in order to ensure a partnership where the student needs can be met.

Measurable Outcome:

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

There will be a 50% reduction in the number of students who have missed 10% or more of the school year.

Monitoring:

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

The school-based leadership team will meet bi-weekly to monitor the attendance of all students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@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 create a monthly "club" where we will meet with students and encourage school attendance, as well as build relationships with students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When meeting with parents about attendance issues, we are often told that students don't want to come to school. We feel the students need to build the positive relationships with staff and feel inclusive in their learning environment. Being a part of a club will help them build the relationships needed, and support students with attending school.

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.

Weekly cat cash store and distribution of cat cash.

Person Responsible: Corey Boyd (boydm@pcsb.org)

By When: Beginning in September and ongoing throughout the year.

Weekly WOW student recognition

Person Responsible: Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)

By When: Every Friday throughout year.

Monthly attendance club

Person Responsible: Shannon O'keeffe (okeeffes@pcsb.org)

By When: September-May

#3. 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.

Explicit instructional practice for novices in learning new content, skill, or concept: 1) full, clear explanations, 2) teacher modeling, 3) Provide a "worked-out" sample with full teacher explanation, 3) Full guidance during student practice, 4) Teacher corrective feedback. Decades of research clearly demonstrate that for novices (comprising virtually all students), direct, explicit instruction is more effective and more efficient than partial guidance. Teachers are more effective when providing explicit guidance with practice and feedback rather than requiring student discovery while learning new skills/concepts. Differentiation consists of the efforts of teachers to respond to variance among learners in the classroom. Whenever a teacher reaches out to an individual or small group to vary his or her teaching in order to create the best learning experience possible, that teacher is differentiating instruction. Teachers can differentiate at least four classroom elements based on student readiness, interest, or learning profile: (1) content—what the student needs to learn or how the student will access the information; (2) process—activities the student engages in to make sense of or master the content; (3) products—culminating projects that ask the student to rehearse, apply, and extend what he or she has learned in a unit; (4) learning environment—how the classroom works and feels. Differentiation should help the students achieve more and feel engaged in school. For example, teachers can make sure that: (1) curriculum is clearly focused on the information and understandings that are most valued by an expert in a particular discipline; (2) lessons, activities, and products are designed to ensure that students grapple with, use, and come to understand those essentials; (3) materials and tasks are interesting to students and seem relevant to them; (4) learning is active; and (5) there is joy and satisfaction in learning for each student.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our current achievement level of performance is 71% as evidenced by the 2022-2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST). We expect our performance level to increase to 75% on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Cycle 3 test for the 23-24 school year by ensuring whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

Monitoring:

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

Progress toward attainment of this area of focus will be monitored utilizing the FAST assessment results between PM1 and PM2. Additionally, walking through classrooms to see explicit instruction with modeling, feedback, and differentiation is occurring in all classrooms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Ovalle (ovallej@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.)

To ensure our black students meet proficiency, we implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our black students are not performing as high as compared to other students on statewide assessments.

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.

Become familiar with the benchmarks in order to understand what the students are expected to master.

Person Responsible: Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing throughout the year

Use formative and summative data to appropriately differentiate grade level questions and/or tasks.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ovalle (ovallej@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

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

Person Responsible: Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

#4. 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.

With a decrease in our science scores this year, we need to focus on increasing our science proficiency scores. Students love hands-on learning and exploring science in the curriculum. We are going to increase our STEM clubs to invite more students to participate as well as focus on the core curriculum. There is a strong correlation between reading and science scores. Embedding more science related articles within small group reading with a focus on lower performing standards. This will help strengthen core curriculum knowledge and provide students with more background knowledge.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our current achievement level of performance is 59%, This is a decrease from the 70% proficiency rate the year prior. We will increase our performance level to 75%

Monitoring:

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

The progress will be monitored with the Science Unit Assessments for 4th and 5th grade and Formative Assessments for grades 1-3 as well as classroom walkthroughs. Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Ovalle (ovallej@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Utilize data from unit assessments to support differentiated instruction and targeted goal setting for black students as well as other students in need of support. Provide consistent effective instruction that promotes student centered learning with rigor during science labs/hands on component during core curriculum. Analyze pre and post lab test results to clarify scientific misconceptions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our black students historically underperform on statewide assessments compared to their peers.

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.

In depth planning to gain a stronger understanding of the standards. Planning will take place with District science staff developer.

Person Responsible: Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)

By When: Teachers will meet with staff developer every two months and Ongoing-throughout the year.

Plan for hands-on activities or experiments to engage students in their learning.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ovalle (ovallej@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

Analyze student data to determine area of support and use reading articles to create flexible grouping

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ovalle (ovallej@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

#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.

Math is an area of strength for our school. We would like to see our school continue to grow and develop mathematicians. We will monitor to ensure the math block consists of the daily warm-up embedded spiral review, core instruction that utilizes hands on exploration, explicit instruction that promotes collaboration, problem-solving, and discourse.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our current achievement level of performance is 81% as evidenced by the 2022-2023 Florida Assessment of

Student Thinking (FAST) Cycle 3 test. We expect our performance level to increase to 85% on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Cycle 3 test.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through unit assessments as well as PM1 and PM2 results. Walkthroughs will occur to ensure differentiation and scaffolds are in place to support student needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@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.)

Support the staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. Ensure rigorous student-centered instruction occurs daily through

the use of McGraw Hill Mathematics, District Math Unit Planning Materials, Dreambox Learning, Number Routines. Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Historically black students underperform on state assessments compared to their peers.

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.

Deeply analyze and plan to gain a stronger understanding of the mathematical benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Monika Wolcott (wolcottm@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing and throughout the year.

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

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ovalle (ovallej@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing and throughout the year.

Plan groups by analyzing formative/summative data to provide support and scaffolds for differentiation.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ovalle (ovallej@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing and throughout the year.

#6. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#7. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#8. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#9. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 principal will meet with stakeholders to plan for funding allocations. The principal will share the SIP as well as the data that supports the goals to improve student achievement. Historically SIP funds are used to purchase books or materials that support the curriculum and provide TDE's so teachers can receive professional development.