

Pinellas County Schools

# James B. Sanderlin K 8 School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>28</b>

## James B. Sanderlin K 8

2350 22ND AVE S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

<http://www.sanderlinib.com/>

### 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.

James B. Sanderlin K-8 is committed to teaching and learning with the brain and heart in mind. Our diverse community of active, lifelong learners will use an inquiry approach through our challenging programmes to become successful internationally-minded citizens.

#### 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
Cormier, Carrie	Principal	
Becker, Megan	Assistant Principal	
Black, Jillian	Assistant Principal	
Chavez, Kourtney	Teacher, K-12	
Herman, Kristen	Magnet Coordinator	
Reeves, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Cassette, Aaron	Teacher, K-12	
Claxton, Lora	Teacher, K-12	
Barlow, William	Teacher, K-12	
Gonzalez, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	
Maggs, Alexandra	Teacher, K-12	
Kearney, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Froitzheim, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Shelburne, Sadie	Teacher, K-12	
White, Denise	Teacher, K-12	
Vilano, Gina	Magnet Coordinator	

#### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The early creation of the SIP begins with the School Based Leadership Team which includes teacher leaders from every grade level and subject area, magnet coordinators, and administration. The draft of the SIP is then presented to SAC and PTSA (which includes student leadership representatives) as well as the full school staff for feedback and review. The SIP one pager and a condensed version of the draft SIP is sent through a school messenger, Class Dojo and put on the website to gain feedback and input for any priorities moving forward. All of this feedback is collected and used to revise any areas of the SIP before final review from the SAC. The SAC committee is emailed the SIP draft after input and revisions are made ahead of the SAC meeting where they will vote to approve the SIP to be submitted for final district review. This process ensures that all stakeholders from multiple different places are represented in the creation and input of the SIP

### 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))

After each FAST and STAR assessment, the faculty comes together in a data chat whole group, SBLT and in small group PLC's with administration to review the data for needs and adjustments to classroom instruction and/or school based plans and initiatives. All teachers are required to complete a data planning, reflection and tracking tool to indicate what their focal places should be and what needs or support they have in meeting those needs. This information is used to update school based needs in the SIP. Principal Cormier then takes the STAR/FAST data to present to the SAC and update them on any adjustments or changes that are made based on the data. This school year the emphasis is on ESE student achievement and growth as well as the trend of reading growth from 3rd to 8th grade which is always highlighted in the data presentation for staff and SAC.

### Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	56%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	49%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B
	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

## 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	11	11	7	14	6	6	18	8	3	84	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	3	13	4	2	27	
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	11	13	14	18	22	10	88	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	9	18	7	16	8	70	
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	2	1	15	7	3	28

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	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) 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	18	17	12	13	7	6	10	2	1	86	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	0	5	3	2	13	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	9	26	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	29	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	11	9	43	

**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	7	7	10	27	12	7	70

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	18	17	12	13	7	6	10	2	1	86	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	0	5	3	2	13	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	9	26	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	23	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	11	9	43	

**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	7	7	10	27	12	7	70

**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*	62	55	53	63	55	55	67		
ELA Learning Gains				56			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			33		
Math Achievement*	66	61	55	61	34	42	62		
Math Learning Gains				62			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			25		
Science Achievement*	60	52	52	64	57	54	61		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	69	68	59	57	59	68		
Middle School Acceleration	74	69	70	75	44	51	85		
Graduation Rate		44	74		49	50			
College and Career Acceleration		17	53		65	70			
ELP Progress		56	55		69	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	405
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	529
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

### ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	25	Yes	2	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	41			
HSP	72			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	85			

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
FRL	48			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	37	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	43			
HSP	53			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	42			

**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**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	62			66			60	71	74			
SWD	26			26				17			4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	81			94							2	
BLK	38			39			26	48	38		6	
HSP	69			74							2	
MUL	55			60			57				3	

## 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	81			85			77	93	90		6	
FRL	42			48			38	52	57		6	

## 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	63	56	39	61	62	50	64	59	75			
SWD	25	45	47	22	43	50	30					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	79	64		95	86							
BLK	40	45	38	36	52	44	40	24	65			
HSP	60	45		53	60				46			
MUL	62	46		65	64							
PAC												
WHT	81	68	58	78	68	67	82	86	85			
FRL	42	44	33	38	47	40	43	27	67			

## 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	67	54	33	62	48	25	61	68	85			
SWD	21	37	33	32	30	10	20					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	80	80		87	60							
BLK	40	35	28	37	30	22	26	35	73			
HSP	75	68		74	45		79		93			
MUL	80	47		67	40							
PAC												
WHT	83	63	20	77	62	31	76	95	82			
FRL	44	37	28	47	36	27	39	48	79			

**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	63%	57%	6%	54%	9%
07	2023 - Spring	61%	48%	13%	47%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	61%	47%	14%	47%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	58%	7%	58%	7%
06	2023 - Spring	57%	47%	10%	47%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	53%	16%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	69%	58%	11%	54%	15%
07	2023 - Spring	33%	36%	-3%	48%	-15%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	62%	7%	59%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	66%	14%	61%	19%
08	2023 - Spring	71%	61%	10%	55%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	61%	-4%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	61%	47%	14%	44%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	59%	60%	-1%	51%	8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	53%	42%	50%	45%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	68%	3%	66%	5%

### 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 lowest area of performance is the SWD. The ESE team this past year was a new team and one staff member left the role mid year to transition into a different role leaving the middle school VE teacher position vacant for half the year. MTSS support this past year was not in place due to some personnel issues on the team that have since been addressed. With the team changes and a fully staffed ESE team with experience set up for this school year, we have set specific goals for tracking and monitoring these students. This is our biggest area of need and focus this next school year.

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

Science scores - specifically 5th grade Science scores showed the greatest decline. The 5th grade team last year was a brand new team. One teacher was brand new to teaching, another brand new to Florida and one teacher quit mid year creating the need to pivot quickly to move another staff member into the position to provide immediate supports. Significant adjustments have been made to the staff for next year and we have identified a teacher strong in Science to bring to the team for collaboration, emphasis and new ideas.

**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 lowest area of performance is the SWD. The ESE team this past year was a new team and one staff member left the role mid year to transition into a different role leaving the middle school VE teacher position vacant for half the year. MTSS support this past year was not in place due to some personnel issues on the team that have since been addressed. With the team changes and a fully staffed ESE team with experience set up for this school year, we have set specific goals for tracking and monitoring these students. This is our biggest area of need and focus this next school year.

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

Our 7th grade Civics scores increased the most. We created a collaborative team of teachers in Civics and used some new resources that were more relevant and engaging for students like IXL Civics. These resources along with the cycle and formative assessment data were able to give the teachers a better understanding of what was working, what wasn't and what still needed remediation. It helped the teachers hone in on student needs and plan to those needs.

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

25% of the incoming 7th grade students demonstrate 2 early warning indicators.

Escalated levels of Kindergarten and 1st grade students missing 10% or more days of school.

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

1) Students with Disabilities data improving so that we are seeing substantial growth, work to close the achievement gap, and at least 45% of these students demonstrating proficiency on the PM3 FAST in 2024.

2) African American student data improving to at least 60% proficient from 48%

3) 5th grade Science data needs to increase to 65% overall proficiency up from 50%.

4) Decrease the decline in reading proficiency from 3rd grade to 8th grade in schoolwide Reading data trends.

**Area of Focus**

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



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

This area of focus is specific to ELA and Reading. Our current level of performance is 63% of students proficient as evidenced by FAST PM 3 data in 2022-2023 for grades 3-8. The problem/gap is occurring because our instruction is not student-centered with rigor for ALL students. If instruction was directly aligned to the BEST standards and student-centered, rigor would occur in a way that ALL students could access grade level critical content and the problem would be reduced by 7%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

- 1) The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase by 7% as measured by state progress monitoring data in 2023-2024 data.
- 2) Students in the bottom quartile will be closely monitored using frequent formative assessment progress monitoring data throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

1. Focused walkthroughs will be conducted weekly using three different tools, ELA look-for's and ELA curriculum document, as well as IB and WICOR focused tools.
2. Meet weekly with PLC's to discuss Unit Planner creation, focused conversations surrounding the BEST Standards, and data chats following each cycle assessment.
3. Monitor Write Score, FAST, and STAR data as an SBLT and make adjustments to the instructional program at each grade level as needed.
4. Monitor Write Score, FAST, and STAR data in MTSS to determine areas of need for additional intervention and/or coaching.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Megan Becker (beckerme@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.)

1. Collaborative learning and structures
2. Classroom discussions utilizing AVID/WICOR strategies
3. Monitor whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block to ensure instruction in both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to research-based principles.
4. Develop a professional learning plan that supports equitable and successful ELA curriculum implementation.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students thrive in classrooms that promote curiosity, inquiry and agency. By tapping into students' curiosities, relevance is created which results in high levels of student engagement. Students are motivated to participate in classroom discussions when they feel valued and heard. Students who are a valued member of their classroom environment feel more comfortable to share their thoughts and ideas, as well as ask questions that promote thinking for themselves and their classmates. Strategic and intentional planning, establishing clear expectations for learning, and providing timely feedback during stretches of independent practice will ensure students build agency and confidence when engaging in complex tasks, independently.

**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.

The leadership team will complete regular walkthroughs in ELA/reading classrooms utilizing the walkthrough tools to monitor instructional strategies and provide meaningful feedback.

**Person Responsible:** Megan Becker (beckerme@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Weekly during the 2023-2024 school year

Meet weekly with PLC's to embed collaborative structures and IB principles into intentional and aligned daily lessons.

**Person Responsible:** Megan Becker (beckerme@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Weekly during the 2023-2024 school year

Intentionally plan inquiry-based activities and student choice to allow for authentic exploration, increased agency, and student-led research into IB unit planners and daily lessons

**Person Responsible:** Megan Becker (beckerme@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Weekly during the 2023-2024 school year

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/ more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.

**Person Responsible:** Megan Becker (beckerme@pcsb.org)

**By When:** By the end of the 2023-2024 school year

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our current level of performance in math is 68% as evidenced by the 2022-2023 PM 3 FAST assessment in grades 3-8. We expect to increase our proficiency to 75% in the 2023-2024 school year. The problem/gap is occurring due to the depth of the benchmarks not being explicitly taught, practiced, and reviewed. We are also not seeing consistent differentiation in all math classrooms. If the depth of the standard was explicitly taught and student instruction was differentiated to meet their individual needs, the problem would be reduced by 7%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

1. The percent of all students achieving Math proficiency will increase by 7%, from 68% to 75% as measured by the 2023-2024 FAST Math PM 3.
2. Students in the bottom quartile will be closely monitored using frequent formative assessment progress monitoring data throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

1. Focused walkthroughs will be conducted weekly to provide feedback to teachers on aligned instructional strategies, IB principles, and differentiated instruction.
2. Meet weekly with PLC's to incorporate high yield instructional strategies, collaborative structures, and student inquiry and agency into IB unit planners and daily lessons.
3. Monitor Dreambox, IXL, and PM data as an SBLT and make adjustments to the instructional program at each grade level as needed.
4. Monitor Dreambox, IXL, and PM data in MTSS to determine areas of need for additional intervention and assistance.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Megan Becker (beckerme@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.)

1. Utilize data to organize students to interact with content in a manner that differentiates instruction for students.
2. Utilize the BIG-M at all grade levels to intentionally plan lessons that meet the depth of the standards.
3. Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.
4. Celebrate students' growth with regards to goal setting and academic progress to encourage the use of high-yield strategies and ensure continuous academic growth.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implementation of the BEST standards and utilization of the BIG-M to ensure the depth of the standards are being met will increase student performance in the math classroom. Utilizing regular formative assessment data will help teachers to identify areas of growth for each student and accurately differentiate instruction for students to close instructional gaps, which will assist in better performance on their PM 3. Correctly identifying student needs and providing interventions that meet their individual needs will

increase math confidence within the classroom. Increased confidence in the content area has a direct correlation with student engagement, which will in turn increase student proficiency.

### **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 utilize systemic documents such as pacing guides, BIG-M, IB Unit planners and curriculum documents to effectively plan for math units that directly align to the benchmarks and achievement level descriptors.

**Person Responsible:** Megan Becker (beckerme@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year

Utilize administrator walkthrough tools to provide weekly feedback to teachers and communicate, highlight evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement.

**Person Responsible:** Megan Becker (beckerme@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Teachers utilize walkthrough data, IXL data, and PM data to identify and plan for differentiated opportunities based on student readiness, interests, and their individual learning profiles to close instructional gaps and increase math confidence in the classroom.

**Person Responsible:** Megan Becker (beckerme@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Monthly throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our current level of performance is 60% of students are proficient, as evidenced by 5th and 8th grade SSA Science data. The problem/gap is occurring because of lack of authentic learning opportunities for students in the lab setting and the need for a better use of formative assessment tools for guiding remediation in science benchmarks. If proper use of the Science lab and better planning and PD around using formative assessments would occur, the problem would be reduced by 5%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By the end of the 2023-2025 school year, Sanderlin will see an increase in their Science SSA proficiency by 10%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Focused walkthroughs will be conducted to provide feedback on IB principles, differentiated instruction, and target-task alignment within the science classrooms. Administration will conduct PLC's to discuss Unit Planner creation, review student responses and formative assessments. Help support and monitor, teacher planning for ALL students, incorporating scaffolding/differentiated instruction into instructional lessons.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jillian Black (blackji@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.)

1. Utilize science curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.
2. Celebrate students' growth with regards to goal setting and academic progress to encourage the use of high-yield strategies and ensure continuous academic growth.
3. Teachers will provide extensive inquiry-based instruction which includes opportunities for students to think scientifically through research, content exploration, and writing opportunities (claims and evidence). In addition, using formative assessment tools in the proper way to facilitate instruction for remediation and differentiation.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There is a need to enhance staff capacity to identify district resources aligned to critical content within NGSSS and the IB standards.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### Action Steps to Implement

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

Implement and utilize the Science Lab on a regular basis with a fully implemented schedule and plan.

**Person Responsible:** Jillian Black (blackji@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Communicate with the district on when Science units have been adjusted for IB UOI's and better align our formative assessments to our actual instructional timeline.

**Person Responsible:** Jillian Black (blackji@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August, 2023

Continue to implement inquiry-based and authentic learning tasks for students within science.

**Person Responsible:** Jillian Black (blackji@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Use formative data, cycle data, and walkthrough feedback data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention, and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance.

**Person Responsible:** Jillian Black (blackji@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies****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.

Our current level of performance is 71% as evidenced by proficiency on the Civics EOC exam and 70% proficiency on the 6th grade US History PM 3. The problem/gap is occurring because the students need to engage in more cognitively complex tasks and interact with rigorous text in manners which differentiate and scaffold instruction to meet the needs of all students. If we implement these strategies, the data will show a 5% increase in overall proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, student proficiency on the Civics EOC will increase to 75%

**Monitoring:**

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

Focused walkthroughs will be conducted by the administrative team focused on high-yield instructional strategies, collaborative structures, district based classroom look-for's. Conduct PLC's to discuss Unit Planner creation, review student responses and formative assessments. Help support and monitor, teacher planning for ALL students, incorporating scaffolding/differentiated instruction into instructional lessons.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Carrie Cormier (cormierc@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.)

1. Reading Strategies based on focus on cognitively complex tasks.
2. Utilize primary source documents at varying complexity levels throughout the year with appropriate literacy strategies across multiple content areas.
3. Utilize WICOR Strategies to build proficiency
4. Write across content areas - using DBQ tasks in social studies classrooms

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implementing high-yield reading, writing, note-taking, and questioning strategies across all content areas will increase proficiency in on social studies 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.

SS Teachers will implement WICOR strategies into daily instruction including intentional collaborative structures, note-taking strategies, writing across content areas and content specific reading tasks.



**Person Responsible:** Carrie Cormier (cormierc@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Students will track data to identify areas of strength and weakness on content standards to determine individual areas of need for specific intervention and focus

**Person Responsible:** Carrie Cormier (cormierc@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year

Teachers will utilize formative assessment data, walkthrough data, and computer-based programming for content standard remediation, data chats with students and individual goal setting with students.

**Person Responsible:** Carrie Cormier (cormierc@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Collaboration on student writing after DBQs using student work analysis protocols.

**Person Responsible:** Carrie Cormier (cormierc@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.



**#5. 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.

As the result of equity-centered problem solving within an MTSS framework, Sanderlin has identified the need for an equity goal to build relational capacity, empower student voice, and hold high expectations for all students. This goal will include whole school, sustained Professional Development and an overall increase the use of equitable practices in the areas of equitable grading, highly engaging strategies for diverse learners (AVID Structures), PBIS full school implementation and restorative practices. The end of year behavior data for African American students showed that 90% of referrals resulted from a core group of 15 African American Students. The focus this year will be on interventions specific to those particular students and how we

can better provide them behavior supports in the Tier 2 and 3 setting.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, the overall percentage of African American referrals will be decreased by 50% through the implementation of PBIS, Tier 2 and 3 behavior supports, Professional Development and implementation of highly engaging strategies for diverse learners (AVID structures), the development of consistent, equitable grading practices, implementation of restorative practices, peer mentoring.

**Monitoring:**

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

A walkthrough schedule on a weekly basis will provide teachers with at least one monthly walkthrough by admin or the MTSS Specialist that focuses specifically on providing feedback to teachers on highly engaging strategies for diverse learners (AVID structures), restorative and PBIS practices. This tool will also be collected

as data to analyze in the MTSS meetings to better determine what Tier 2 and 3 interventions need to be created, increased, or changed.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@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.)

Sanderlin will work to impact the equity mindset of teachers to improve and increase equitable instructional practices, specifically equitable grading, the implementation of PBIS, highly engaging strategies for diverse learners (AVID structures) and restorative practices.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The data explored using the Racial Equity Analysis Protocol (REAP) protocol identifies this as an area of focus which has been demonstrated to impact student learning and success. The changes in staff practices using the evidence based strategies above and the action steps below will decrease student behaviors and increase student achievement. Progress Monitoring will take place throughout the school year using formative assessments and other program assessments such as MAP data, cycle data, iReady, iStation and

Dreambox data to determine the effectiveness of the strategies.

### **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) Conduct a monthly staff book study on Equitable Grading Practices and Assessment by Trevor McKenzie.
- 2) Conduct district created facilitated staff equity training and guide staff through creating equitable grading practices.
- 3) Conduct two restorative practices sessions to continue to re-enforce the use of restorative practices throughout the whole school community.
- 4) Equity champions will provide monthly discipline and achievement data for review at SBLT, MTSS to determine effectiveness of strategies being implemented the need to adjust any focus areas.

**Person Responsible:** Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Monthly during the 2023-2024 school year.

**#6. 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.

Our SWD subgroup achievement has been increasing but there is still a 26% achievement gap in the achievement levels of our SWD students in comparison to our total school proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By implementing the strategies below, our SWD subgroup will increase the total number proficient from 37% to 50%.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area will be monitored through the review of ESE schedules, FAST data, ISIP, IXL and Dreambox data on a regular basis. ESE schedules will be reviewed to determine if we are maximizing classroom push in support during core time and adjusting any interventions or plans based on the most immediate data needs. Focused walkthroughs by administration during the schedule ESE push in and pull out times will be conducted on a schedule and PLC meetings with the ESE department will discuss instructional and achievement trends on a monthly basis.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Carrie Cormier (cormierc@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.)

Weekly opportunities for ESE teachers to co-plan lessons to ensure that differentiated instruction and direct ESE student supports are happening in the classroom to maximize student learning of grade level content with scaffolded support from the ESE teacher.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiation is a critical component of ensuring that all student needs are met and walkthrough data consistently identifies this as an area of need in our classrooms. The increase of ESE Resource teachers creating differentiation plans for students in collaboration with PLC's has helped us begin to see growth in our ESE students and their achievement. With a new ESE team this year, we would like to expand on where we started with this task to ensure that we continue to see growth in proficiency with our ESE students.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

- 1) VE Resource teachers will take part in at least two scheduled collaborative planning sessions a month with Grade level PLC teachers where they will intentionally plan for differentiation using ESE student data.
- 2) Lesson plan/unit plans will indicate differentiation strategies the teachers are using with all students and how the VE Resource teacher is using these strategies in a co teach model or pull out model with students.
- 3) Grade level PLC;s will collect and interpret data from multiple data sources including FAST, Dreambox, IXL, iStation and iReady to monitor progress with IEP goals and objectives and drive instruction based on student need, including regular and purposeful adjustments to accommodations and interventions.

**Person Responsible:** Carrie Cormier (cormierc@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Actions will take place ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

### 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).

Sanderlin uses multiple processes to ensure that we received feedback on the school improvement funding allocations. The School Based Leadership Team reviews and works together to create the SIP and the budget for the SIP along with the SAC and PTSA. This is then reviewed by all staff for feedback. After final revisions are made, the budget is submitted to SAC for final approval and review. The school Principal - Carrie Cormier takes a copy of the budget and any budget expenditures that were used in accordance to what was approved to each monthly SAC meeting. If there are any proposed changes or proposals that were not originally approved in the plan, the principal presents it to the SAC for review and approval with a justification and rationale for the request and how it aligns with the needs of the school.

### Budget to Support Areas of Focus

#### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			3761 - James B. Sanderlin K 8	School Improvement Funds		\$2,000.00
			Notes: To support TDE's and Contract Binders for teachers to work in collaborative planning to adjust instruction based on FAST data, to plan collaboratively with ESE teachers for differentiated instruction and co teaching.			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies				\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24

			3761 - James B. Sanderlin K 8	School Improvement Funds		\$1,000.00
			Notes: To support the purchase of IXL Civics to use directly with students to prepare them for the Civics EOC.			
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			3761 - James B. Sanderlin K 8	School Improvement Funds		\$1,000.00
			Notes: To support the purposeful and intentional use of PBIS/RISE on campus - visible displays around campus, the use of PBIS rewards to increase student engagement and motivation.			
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
Total:						\$4,000.00

### Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes