

Pinellas County Schools

Maximo Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Maximo Elementary School

4850 31ST ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

<http://www.maximoelementary.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.

The mission of Maximo Elementary School is to ensure rigorous educational opportunities, promote highest scholar achievement, and inspire scholars to become leaders beyond the classroom.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide every scholar with equitable and rigorous standards based instruction in order for him/her to successfully make at least a year's growth of learning.

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
Austin, Lisa	Principal	Facilitates and monitors the execution and implementation process of School Improvement Plan.
Johnson, Tenishelah	Assistant Principal	Supports execution, monitoring and implementation process of School Improvement Plan.
Riley, Cassandra	Instructional Coach	Works directly with the school-based leadership team (SBLT) and classroom teachers in assisting with the full implementation and monitoring of interventions needed for scholar achievement.
Byrd, Felicia	Math Coach	Works directly with the school-based leadership team (SBLT) and classroom teachers in assisting with the full implementation and monitoring of the district's adopted math program in response to intervention needed for scholar achievement.
Harrison, Mercedes	School Counselor	Promotes scholar success while providing preventive services, and responding to identified scholar needs through the implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program that addresses academic, personal and social development for all scholars.
Pe, Cheryl	Psychologist	Works to support the success of scholars academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally. Collaborates with educators, parents, and other professionals to create safe, healthy, and supportive learning environments that strengthen connections between home, school, and the community for all students. Identifies and assesses the learning, development, and adjustment characteristics and needs of individuals and groups, as well as, the environmental factors that affect learning and adjustment. Provides interventions to students to support the teaching process and to maximize learning and adjustment. Assists in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs to meet identified learning and adjustment needs. Delivers a planned and coordinated program of psychological services.
Williams, Iris		Works to support the success of scholas academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally. Collaborates with educators, parents, and other professionals to create safe, healthy, and supportive learning environments that strengthen connections between home, school, and the community for all

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	----------------	---------------------------------

scholars. Identifies and assesses the learning, development, and adjustment characteristics and needs of individuals and groups, as well as the environmental factors that affect learning and adjustment. Provides interventions to scholars to support the teaching process and to maximize learning and adjustments. Assists in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs to meet identified learning and adjustment needs. Delivers a planned and coordinated program of psychological services.

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 process used in the development of the SIP included members of the SBLT meeting and using data to determine school-specific strengths and weaknesses for each curriculum area. We reviewed the previous year SIP, its implementation, and the student results from state results to identify components that worked well and others that were challenging. This information was then used to update the school's areas strengths and focus areas for the upcoming school year with an emphasis on assessing the school's progress related to the objectives in curriculum goals.

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))

Implementation and adjustments will be made throughout the year. This plan will continuously be used as a "living" document throughout the year. If student data suggests that a strategy/action is not working, the SIP be revised and updated to reflect the steps we will take to ensure students learn. Instructional coaches will meet with each principal weekly to provide frequent monitoring and support to ensure we are on track to meet our benchmarks. Plan goals will be reviewed in October, January, and April to discuss what mid-course corrections may be required.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes

2022-23 Minority Rate	92%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	29	35	36	22	14	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	2	12	4	9	9	0	0	0	36
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	17	24	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	18	20	21	0	0	0	59
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	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	6	14	20	13	0	0	0	55

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	47	42	30	57	28	35	0	0	0	239
One or more suspensions	1	1	14	37	8	2	0	0	0	63
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	10	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	15	11	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	20	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	20	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	14	0	0	0	0	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	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	3	3	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	47	42	30	57	28	35	0	0	0	239
One or more suspensions	1	1	14	37	8	2	0	0	0	63
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	10	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	15	11	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	20	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	20	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	14	0	0	0	0	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	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	3	3	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	26	54	53	26	55	56	32		
ELA Learning Gains				49			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			47		
Math Achievement*	28	61	59	36	51	50	30		
Math Learning Gains				58			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				86			67		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	15	62	54	31	62	59	30		
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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	23
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	92
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	350
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
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	7	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	19	Yes	1	1
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	21	Yes	1	1

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	33	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	53			

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	26			28			15					
SWD	4			9							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23			24			15				4	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	23			26			14				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	26	49	64	36	58	86	31					
SWD	16	55		17	45							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	49	67	32	55	85	25					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	24	53	65	35	65	94	32					

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	32	40	47	30	54	67	30					
SWD	10			14								
ELL												

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	26	39	47	26	58	67	27					
HSP	40			40								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	27	27	36	27	47	67	27					

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	29%	57%	-28%	54%	-25%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	58%	-21%	58%	-21%
03	2023 - Spring	19%	53%	-34%	50%	-31%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	32%	62%	-30%	59%	-27%
04	2023 - Spring	32%	66%	-34%	61%	-29%
05	2023 - Spring	15%	61%	-46%	55%	-40%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	17%	60%	-43%	51%	-34%

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.

Based on 2023 state assessment the data components that showed the lowest performance was the area of 5th grade Science. Science decreased from 31% to 15% in grade 5. The contributing factor(s) for low Science performance include foundational gaps in grades 3-5 science benchmarks and inconsistent use of data to plan for differentiation and scaffold instruction to increase student achievement. The gaps in content mastery are not being closed at a pace sufficiently, therefore, contributes to decreases in proficiency.

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

Science was the component with the greatest decline with a decrease of 16%. The contributing factors of the decrease is Science proficiency include, lack of experience, teacher retention, foundational gaps in pre-requisite science benchmark, and inconsistent use of data to plan for differentiation and scaffolded instruction to increase student achievement. The gaps in content mastery are not being filled thereby causing ongoing decreases in proficiency.

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 is the data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The contributing factors of the gaps in Science proficiency include, lack of experience, teacher retention, foundational gaps in pre-requisite science benchmark, and inconsistent use of data to plan for differentiation and scaffolded instruction to increase student achievement. The gaps in content mastery are not being filled thereby causing ongoing decreases in proficiency.

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

ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 showed the most improvement based on previous year's proficiency data. ELA proficiency increased from 26% to 30%. The actions that contributed to this improvement were, teachers disaggregating data with the instructional coaches during weekly PLCs to determine specific standards that need remediation, teachers collaboratively planning with the coaches for targeted small group instruction and planning for daily higher order questions. The used of AVID WICOR strategies, walkthroughs and continuous feedback.

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

The two areas of the EWS data of concern are, students with 10% or greater absenteeism and, the number of students scoring level 1 on the state assessments in both ELA and Math.

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

1. Culture and climate
2. Teacher retention

3. Target task alignment
4. Increase student proficiency across grade levels

Area of Focus

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

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

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

Standards-based data (FAST state assessment, common assessments, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2022-2023 school year showed scholars performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Scholars are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support rigorous learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency in Science will increase 25% (from 15% to 40%), as measured by the Science Standards Assessment. Proficiency in ELA will increase 10% (from 30% to 40 %), as measured by FAST. Proficiency in Mathematics will increase 11% (from 29% to 40%), as measured by FAST. Black student proficiency in ELA will increase 10% as measured by PM 3 of the state FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Monitored through weekly leadership walkthroughs and administrative walkthroughs with actionable feedback.

Monitored through bi-weekly data analysis and student work analysis and differentiated instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Austin (austinli@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.)

Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles. Utilizing I-Ready materials for interventions, utilizing benchmarks focused materials based on formal and informal assessments. Support and strengthen staff ability to prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing across ALL content areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our quantitative and qualitative data during the 2022-23 school year reveals that utilizing data to plan for differentiation, intervention, and providing necessary scaffolds within core instruction are areas to focus on to close our current achievement gaps.

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.

Ensure teachers have a deep understanding of the K-5 B.E.S.T ELA and Math Standards. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.

Person Responsible: Lisa Austin (austinli@pcsb.org)

By When: This step will be on-going and will utilize data to make necessary adjustments throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs and more advanced texts for students above benchmark.

Person Responsible: Lisa Austin (austinli@pcsb.org)

By When: This step will be on-going and will utilize data to make necessary adjustments throughout the 2023-24 school year.

These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.

Person Responsible: Lisa Austin (austinli@pcsb.org)

By When: This step will be on-going and will utilize data to make necessary adjustments throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Our SBLT will continue to develop data-driven interventions that eliminate educational inequities and improve student outcomes.

Person Responsible: Lisa Austin (austinli@pcsb.org)

By When: This step will be on-going and will utilize data to make necessary adjustments throughout the 2023-24 school year.

#2. 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.

Upon data review, our ESE performance scores have shown minimal gains over the least three years. Increases in our ESE subgroup will lead to learning gaps significantly decreasing and overall school score improvement. Due to the lack of inclusion structures where the Gen-ed and VE Resource teachers collaboratively co-teach to provide differentiation. If both, Gen-ed and VE Resource teachers consistently utilize data to plan for differentiation and scaffold instruction to increase the achievement of SWD, the problem/gap would be reduced by closing the achievement gap between our ESE and non-ESE students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD proficiency in ELA will increase 10% (from), as measured by district and PM3 FAST state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be monitored through ILT meetings, walk-throughs (with actionable feedback), and bi-weekly data chats with teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Austin (austinli@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.)

Instruct students with disabilities in foundational skills necessary to engage in rigorous, grade-level content. VE Resource teacher Co-Teaching using small group rotations to address learning gaps and differentiate instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students have a better chance of mastering grade level standards if the majority of their day is spent in a Gen Ed classroom. ESE teachers will collaborate and co-teach with Gen Ed classrooms in order to provide specialized instruction to ESE while aligning to grade level standards. Foundational gaps will be addressed during the intervention block in small groups.

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.

Provide embedded PD and coaching supports centered around utilizing data to drive instruction.

Person Responsible: Lisa Austin (austinli@pcsb.org)

By When: This will be on going throughout the school year and adjusted as data suggest.

Ensure the ESE teachers receive on going PD aligned to implementing standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Lisa Austin (austinli@pcsb.org)

By When: This will be on going throughout the school year and adjusted as data suggest.

Schedule structured, collaborative planning session with Content Coaches.

Person Responsible: Tenishelah Johnson (johnsonten@pcsb.org)

By When: This will be on going throughout the school year and adjusted as data suggest.

Ensure instructional supports are in place during core instruction and independent practice for students with exceptional needs. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.

Person Responsible: Tenishelah Johnson (johnsonten@pcsb.org)

By When: This will be on going throughout the school year and adjusted as data suggest.

Implement a process for placing students of ESE in master schedule first in order to optimize service delivery and focus on a clustering process to meet student needs.

Person Responsible: Tenishelah Johnson (johnsonten@pcsb.org)

By When: This will be on going throughout the school year and adjusted as data suggest.

Provide time for gen ed and ESE staff to collaborate and co-plan on developing SDI that meets the needs of students.

Person Responsible: Lisa Austin (austinli@pcsb.org)

By When: This will be on going throughout the school year and adjusted as data suggest.

Create a climate where IEPs are adjusted as needed based on the data and needs of students.

Person Responsible: Tenishelah Johnson (johnsonten@pcsb.org)

By When: This will be on going throughout the school year and adjusted as data suggest.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Scholar attendance was selected due to data pulled during the 2022-23 school year, 30% of our scholars were absence 10% percent or more for the instructional school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The rate of absences 10% or more will decrease by 10% as measured by the attendance data in Focus.

Monitoring:

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

Child Study Team (CST) meetings bi-weekly to utilize the problem-solving for grade level and specific student attendance. The Social Worker/Attendance will conduct home visits and parent conferences with families who have chronic absences and/or tardies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Iris Williams (williamsi@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.)

Create a three-tiered approach that starts with foundational support for the whole school. These foundational supports are followed by prevention-oriented supports (Tier1), more personalized outreach (Tier 2), and intensive intervention (Tier 3).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Missing more than 10% of school in one school year puts the scholar at risk for retention. Strengthening the Tiered process will build stronger relationships between the schools and families while helping to identify barriers that are attributed to high rate of absences.

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.

Strengthen the implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III attendance interventions to address and support the needs of our scholars.

Person Responsible: Iris Williams (williamsi@pcsb.org)

By When: This will be on-going all school year and adjusted as data suggests.

Child Study Team will meet bi-weekly to review and discuss Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Using problem solving to address and adjust interventions based on need.

Person Responsible: Iris Williams (williamsi@pcsb.org)

By When: This will be on-going all school year and adjusted as data suggests.

Attendance Specialist/DMT and Social Worker will continue providing parents with district populated letters informing parent/guardian(s) of their child's attendance as well as hold parent conferences, conduct home visits, and/or refer families with chronic attendance issues to the State Attorney's Office. Child Study Team and School-Based Leadership Team will review and problem-solve around attendance data.

Person Responsible: Iris Williams (williamsi@pcsb.org)

By When: This will be on-going all school year and adjusted as data suggests.

Continue offering services from the Suncoast Counselor and Family Navigator as well as other community resources to address and/or eliminate attendance barriers.

Person Responsible: Iris Williams (williamsi@pcsb.org)

By When: This will be on-going all school year and adjusted as data suggests.

#4. 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.

School will increase parent engagement and attendance to school events. Past parent engagement data reflects the need for increased involvement. Research demonstrates parent engagement increases student academic performance and provides community within the school and home.

Measurable Outcome:

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

School will increase parent engagement and attendance at family events by 10% as measured by parent surveys, sign-in sheets and exit tickets.

Monitoring:

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

We will upload post event surveys, sign-in sheets and materials/resources provided to families to Title I crate.

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).

Pinellas County Schools Superintendent and the Pinellas County School Board have invested in a strong support structure that creates an increasing number of strategies and interventions to support schools in need. The district has robust systems, processes, and measures to continually review the progress in the schools in

support of their continued improvement. Data review has informed the various aspects of this plan. It connects several ongoing monitoring systems to support the schools in alignment with the domains for school turnaround: Effective Leadership, Collaborative Teaching, Ambitious Instruction and Learning, Safe and Supportive Environment, and Family and Community Engagement. The Leadership Team will continue to meet weekly to monitor the progress of our Differentiated Accountability (DA) schools. Issues identified in the process include but are not limited to the following: teacher concerns, staffing model, technology, facilities, instructional practices, the effectiveness of School-based Leadership Teams, coaching support model, allocation of resources, progress monitoring, and student performance. The team evaluates identified issues weekly and establishes a plan of action to resolve them effectively and efficiently.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and actional feedback.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

ELA proficiency 70% of scholars' grades 3-5 scored below level 3 as measured by previous year's PM3 state assessment. The actions that will focus on improvement, teachers disaggregating data with the instructional coaches during weekly PLCs to determine specific standards that need remediation, teachers collaboratively planning with the coaches for targeted small group instruction and planning for daily higher order questions. The used of AVID WICOR strategies, cycles of coaching, walkthroughs and continuous actional feedback.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

The percentage of students in grades K-2 scoring below proficiency as measured by previous years PM3 STAR Early Literacy/STAR Reading assessment will decrease by 20% as measured by current year's PM3 STAR Early Literacy/STAR Reading Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring below level 3 on previous year's PM3 state assessment will decrease by 25% as measured by current year's PM3 state assessment.

Monitoring**Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

During weekly PLCs teachers disaggregate data with the instructional coaches to determine specific standards that need remediation, teachers collaboratively planning with the coaches for targeted small group instruction and planning for daily higher order questions. The used of AVID WICOR strategies, walkthroughs and continuous actional feedback. The impact of the actions will provide students a deeper understanding of grade level specific standards and continue to close instructional gaps.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Austin, Lisa, austinli@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

- o Provides print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction
- o Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words
- o Reinforce the effectiveness of instruction in alphabets, fluency, and vocabulary
- o Provide instruction in broad oral language skills
- o Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies
- o Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

To develop literacy, students need instruction in two related sets of skills: foundational reading skills and reading comprehension skills. Employing the evidence-based strategies and action steps will enable students to read words (alphabets), relate those words to their oral language, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency to understand what they read.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>o Literacy Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School Literacy Leadership Teams are meeting regularly to look at data to make informed decisions about what professional learning and supports need to be in place to maximize student growth in reading. -Build capacity by identifying teachers, coaches and district staff who can support training in the use of evidence-based curriculum, instruction, and intervention aligned to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. - School Literacy Leadership Team plan family reading nights grounded in family friendly evidence-based practices to support the homeschool connection. 	<p>Austin, Lisa, austinli@pcsb.org</p>
<p>o Literacy Coaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Literacy coaches work with school principals to plan and implement consistent professional learning using strategies that demonstrate a significant effect on improving student outcomes. - Literacy coaches prioritize time to those teachers, activities, and roles that will have the greatest impact on student achievement in reading, namely coaching, modeling, and mentoring in classrooms daily. - Literacy coaches support and train teachers to administer assessments, analyze data and use data to differentiate instruction. 	<p>Austin, Lisa, austinli@pcsb.org</p>
<p>o Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop a structure for ongoing formative assessment is in place to determine where instruction should be modified to meet individual student needs - Determine a structure for conducting screening, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessments is in place to identify students with a substantial deficiency in reading. 	<p>Johnson, Tenishelah, johnsonten@pcsb.org</p>
<p>o Professional learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are guided by assessment data and are ongoing, engaging, interactive, collaborative, and job-embedded and provide time for teachers to collaborate, research, conduct lesson studies, and plan instruction. - School-based teams are provided professional learning sessions on the science of reading and evidence-based literacy instruction, materials, and assessment. - School-based teams provide training to teachers that integrate the six components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language, comprehension, and vocabulary) into an explicit, systematic, and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies. 	<p>Riley, Cassandra, rileyc@pcsb.org</p>

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be disseminated to students by addresses specified school goals in classroom meetings and student data chats. Families will have an opportunity to engage in the details of the plan during the Title I Open House meeting and links will be provided to school website with plan information. SIP will be added as an agenda item for SAC for discussion and school Principal with outline plan to staff and provide link to plan during "State of the School" address. SIP can be found at: <https://www.pcsb.org/Page/39019>

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.

List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Maximo Elementary plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders through the use of Class Dojo to share positive updates, Family/Community school events, Content Nights, Conference Nights

- PTA/SAC
- Mentoring
- Community Partnerships
- Volunteering
- Parent Recognition Program

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The plan will strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum by:

- Removing barriers and create equitable, inclusive learning experiences for all children.
- Providing the highest quality teaching and learning environment.
- Developing and retain a diverse, highly effective educator workforce.
- Cultivating high-impact systems, structures, and partnerships
- Tracking scholar progress towards proficiency and beyond.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

n/a

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: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No