Brooker Creek Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Brooker Creek Elementary School

3130 FORELOCK RD, Tarpon Springs, FL 34688

http://www.brooker-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.

Brooker Creek Elementary, a community that encourages growth by valuing each other's differences, respecting everyone and creating life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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
Hodges, Josh	Principal	Oversees school instructional delivery.
Gerber, Kristie	Assistant Principal	Oversees school instructional delivery.
McMullen, Casey	Teacher, K-12	Delivers instruction.
Gabbert, Danielle	Instructional Media	Delivers instruction.
Hickman, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Delivers instruction.

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.

School administration reviewed student data, current instructional teacher trends on campus, and spoke with several teachers regarding the use of small group instruction on campus. After it was determined that small group delivery would be a model to continue and refine on campus, the SIP was written to utilize the school's current strengths while identifying appropriate next steps. This draft plan was shared with the staff and parents.

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))

Data will be reviewed after students complete PM2 Fast assessments. Additionally, data will be reviewed after appropriate district assessments are completed. Grade levels will meet in PLC to review student data, complete item analysis to determine success towards previously taught standards, and to make action plans to reteach required standards.

School administration will conduct frequent walkthroughs and monitor the implementation of small group instruction. Conversations with instructional staff regarding the student goals and success towards meeting them will take place throughout the year

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	23%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	16%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	6	12	12	6	7	0	0	0	43
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	0	6	12	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) 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	11	10	9	8	13	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	11	10	9	8	13	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	69	54	53	77	55	56	80		
ELA Learning Gains				68			88		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			79		
Math Achievement*	86	61	59	86	51	50	82		
Math Learning Gains				65			79		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			67		
Science Achievement*	82	62	54	75	62	59	92		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		64	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	310
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	66			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	85			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	70			

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	41			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	70			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	55			

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			86			82					
SWD	54			74			77				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	81			90							3	
MUL	58			100							2	
PAC												
WHT	68			84			84				4	
FRL	60			86			73				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	77	68	55	86	65	51	75					
SWD	43	41	38	56	40	27	40					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	82	61		81	65		60					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	77	69	56	86	65	54	74					
FRL	54	50	50	71	56	50	56					

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	80	88	79	82	79	67	92					
SWD	46			31								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	79			64								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80	87	81	85	83	86	94					
FRL	61	82		67	73		75					

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	74%	57%	17%	54%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	58%	11%	58%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	72%	53%	19%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	97%	62%	35%	59%	38%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	66%	16%	61%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	81%	61%	20%	55%	26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	82%	60%	22%	51%	31%

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.

Students proficient in ELA was at 72% in 2023. This decline is a product of new benchmarks and assessments. Teachers were in the process of adapting materials and test prep to better align with the new assessments."

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

Students proficient in ELA declined from 77% in 2022 to 72% in 2023. This decline is a product of new benchmarks and assessments. Teachers were in the process of adapting materials and test prep to better align with the new assessments."

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.

Brooker Creek surpassed the state average in all areas.

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

Science scores showed the most improvement. Efforts were made to increase hands-on lessons utilizing small group instruction as well as utilizing PDCA cycles following assessments. Teachers were given time to plan with each other, reviewing data, and following up after re-teaching took place.

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

6 students in 4th grade scored level 1 in ELA.
12 students in 5th grade scored level 1 in ELA.

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

Small group instruction in all content throughout all grade levels.
Structured collaboration with grade level PLC.
Refining MTSS process for tier 2 students.

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 Small Group 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.

18 total students scored a level 1 on the ELA FAST test and 4 total students scored a level 1 on the Math FAST test. These smaller numbers of students would have their needs best met through strategic differentiation delivered in a small group setting. Because small groups delivery is effective at reaching each student, small group instruction may also be utilized in core instruction as appropriate.

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

ELA student proficiency will increase 5%.
Math student proficiency will increase 2%.
Science student proficiency will increase 3%.

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

Identified students (level 1) will be monitored for learning during various assessments throughout the year including the state FAST assessments and various district assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Josh Hodges (hodgesjo@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.)

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 get access to the information; (2) process–activities in which the student engages in order 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; and (4) learning environment–the way the classroom works and feels.

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

Facilitate meaningful mathematical discourse. Effective teaching of mathematics facilitates discourse among students to build shared understanding of mathematical ideas by analyzing and comparing student approaches and arguments.
Pose purposeful questions. Effective teaching of mathematics uses purposeful questions to assess and advance students' reasoning and sense making about important mathematical ideas and relationships.
Elicit and use evidence of student thinking. Effective teaching of mathematics uses evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward mathematical understanding and to adjust instruction continually in ways that support and extend learning.
Differentiation helps students achieve more. Teachers can make sure that: curriculum is clearly focused on the information and understandings that are most valued by an expert in a particular discipline; lessons, activities, and products are designed to ensure that students grapple with, use, and come to understand those essentials; materials and tasks are interesting to students and seem relevant to them; learning is active.

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.

• Employ instructional practices and routines that promote student-centered learning (Higher-Order Questioning, Pinellas Problem Solving Routine, Play-Explore-Investigate (PEI) Routine, Number Sense Making Routines, Collaborative structures, High-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback).

Person Responsible: Josh Hodges (hodgesjo@pcsb.org)

By When: December 2023

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and intervention, based on data, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced tasks for students above benchmark.

Person Responsible: Josh Hodges (hodgesjo@pcsb.org)

By When: December 2023

Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark in the early grades, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.

Person Responsible: Josh Hodges (hodgesjo@pcsb.org)

By When: December 2023

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

Person Responsible: Josh Hodges (hodgesjo@pcsb.org)

By When: December 2023

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

Person Responsible: Josh Hodges (hodgesjo@pcsb.org)

By When: December 2023

#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.

Implement goal setting opportunities where students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals, monitoring their academic progress throughout the year, revising their goals based on data, and celebrating successes.

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

80% of students in grades 1 through 5 will meet their own academic goal.

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

Students will establish a baseline data piece during the PM1 test session. Teachers will work with students to establish goals for PM2 and PM3. These goals will be monitored by students and teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristie Gerber (gerberk@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.)

Over 1,000 studies have consistently shown that setting high and specific goals is linked to increased task performance, persistence, and motivation, compared to vague or easy goals (Locke and Latham, 2002, 2006).

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

Students perform better when they know their end goal and when strategies to meet goals are discussed along the way. As students improve and their success is recognized, positive emotion creates an intrinsic desire within students to keep improving.

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.

Establish baseline scores for students in grades 1-5 during the PM1 test window. From these scores and using available table data, determine how many points are needed to reach proficiency as well as how many points are needed to make learning gains. Determine a mid-point score range for PM2.

Person Responsible: Kristie Gerber (gerberk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing through May.

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.