

Pinellas County Schools

Tarpon Springs Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Tarpon Springs Elementary School

555 PINE ST, Tarpon Springs, FL 34689

<http://www.tarpon-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mission: To promote highest student achievement in a safe learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: 100% Student Success.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cook, Kim	Principal	
Saccasyn, Thea	Assistant Principal	
Harper, Tania	Instructional Coach	
Chaisson, Joanne	School Counselor	
Post, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
Allston, Judy	Teacher, K-12	
Kruty, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	

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 school leadership team meets to work on the SIP over the summer. The SIP is shared with the faculty for input, updates and then voted on. Once approved by the staff it is shared with SAC for their input and approval.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be reviewed regularly to monitor implementation and if the strategies being used are increasing student achievement. It will be revised as needed to ensure that student achievement is improving.

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	70%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 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	1	4	22	18	13	14	0	0	0	72	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	9	9	9	0	0	0	27	
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	3	3	1	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	46	35	0	0	0	82	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	29	24	0	0	0	53	
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	4	8	25	41	35	0	0	0	113

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	0	25	33	37	27	24	0	0	0	146	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

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	0	25	33	37	27	24	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	

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*	48	54	53	40	55	56	42		
ELA Learning Gains				57			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			84		
Math Achievement*	55	61	59	53	51	50	57		
Math Learning Gains				62			68		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				74			70		
Science Achievement*	67	62	54	55	62	59	42		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	71	64	59	80			76		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	285
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	486
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	49			
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	61			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	54			

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	42			
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	60			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	58			

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	48			55			67					71
SWD	39			44			64				4	
ELL	38			63			70				5	71
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			39			44				4	
HSP	53			65			81				5	66
MUL	65			53							2	
PAC												
WHT	57			64			64				4	
FRL	43			53			65				5	68

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	40	57	65	53	62	74	55					80
SWD	16	53		39	58							
ELL	37	52		56	52							80
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	29	58		33	58	64	50					
HSP	40	52		55	62		71					79
MUL	57	67		53	62							
PAC												
WHT	43	52		68	64		44					
FRL	34	52	71	49	58	73	46					81

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	42	64	84	57	68	70	42					76
SWD	32	62		37	60	70	40					
ELL	38	86		61	86		29					76
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	47		35	44		22					
HSP	47	70		58	81		36					72
MUL	50			73								
PAC												
WHT	49	64		74	70		61					
FRL	39	63	88	55	71	75	40					81

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	67%	57%	10%	54%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	58%	-12%	58%	-12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	38%	53%	-15%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	36%	62%	-26%	59%	-23%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	66%	4%	61%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	61%	14%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	60%	3%	51%	12%

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 ELA scores for 22-23 were the lowest at 50%. In 21-22, that score was 40%, demonstrating 10% growth from last year. Contributing factors include small group instruction, increased human resource support with hourly and intervention teachers, continued progress monitoring and scheduled data reviews with teachers.

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

Overall scores in ELA, Math and Science increased from 21-22. Third grade math scores showed a 16% decrease from 52% to 36%. The major factor contributing to this decline was the high number of students who entered third grade below proficiency in Math.

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 ELA score continues to lag behind the state average, which was 52% in 21-22. We continue to analyze factors that contribute, including student mobility.

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

Our science scores show the most improvement at 12% growth. We focused on remediation of gaps in 3rd and 4th grade standards, including providing intervention services in 5th grade.

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

The number of students missing 10% of school days is a concern. We have been providing incentives, making frequent parent contacts and creating, and nurturing mentoring relationships with students through our First Mates program to increase student connection to school.

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

Attendance
ELA achievement
Math Achievement
Science Achievement

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.

Human resource will be maximized to increase rigorous, culturally relevant, standards-based instruction to students. By utilizing the MTSS coach, interventionists, and specialists through collaborative and facilitated planning and the use of planbook.com, teachers will assure the delivery of high quality, standards-based lessons to students. Our scores are near or above state averages.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA: By Spring of 2024, the percentage of students achieving 3 or above on the state assessment, will exceed 63%.

Math: By Spring of 2024, the percentage of students achieving 3 or above on the state assessment, will exceed 63%.

Science: By Spring of 2024, the percentage of students achieving 3 or above on the state assessment, will exceed 70%.

Monitoring:

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

Progress will be monitored through administrative observation, PLC data discussions and district assessments including ISIP, the science diagnostic and common assessments, and math unit assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Cook (cookkim@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.)

Evidenced based instruction includes Jan Richardson Guided Reading groups, use of Istation, Dreambox, small targeted math groups, including fluency routines. Teachers will utilize planbook.com to make these instructional plans.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier 2 intervention strategies involve small, teacher directed groups in reading, math and science. In addition to utilizing technology resources that reinforcement benchmarks. Intervention teachers, a paraprofessional and MTSS coach will provide Human Resource support for this 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.

- Increase volume of reading in grade level text, with discussion and feedback. Assure students receive differentiated instruction and individualized feedback and support in math. Assess previous grade level gaps in science and provide instruction to eliminate any existing deficits in knowledge.

Person Responsible: Kim Cook (cookkim@pcsb.org)

By When: Spring, 2024

- Teachers and administrators provide ALL students with consistent opportunities to engage in in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark.

Person Responsible: Kim Cook (cookkim@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

- Teachers and administrators employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to: positive expectations for success; meaningful tasks related to student interests & cultural backgrounds; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.

Person Responsible: Kim Cook (cookkim@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

- Increase high-level academic discussions among and between students by developing benchmark aligned questions that deepen the students' understanding of the content presented.

Person Responsible: Kim Cook (cookkim@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

- Implement the gradual release model of learning and scaffold the activities assigned based on student needs.

Person Responsible: Kim Cook (cookkim@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

- Learning Labs will be scheduled and held to review standards and close gaps with grades 3-5 students supported by interventionists.

Person Responsible: Kim Cook (cookkim@pcsb.org)

By When: Beginning in September and then Ongoing

#2. 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.

Approximately 35% of our students missed 10% or more of their school days during the 22-23 school. As a result, action plans are being created to improve student attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By spring of 2024, less than 20% of enrolled students will miss 10% or more of their school days

Monitoring:

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

The Child Study Team will review attendance data bi-weekly. Data will be provided to teachers biweekly so that they are well informed of attendance patterns of the students in their classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will call families of absent students. A process will be followed by the CST that includes parent contacts and home visits by the school social worker.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The teacher will make first contact with families to emphasize care of concern for the student's absence. Efforts will first be made by classroom teachers to assure students are in attendance daily and barriers are overcome.

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.

- Implementation of Restorative Practices across campus and embedded into school activities.

Person Responsible: Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

- Tier 1 PBIS program that includes a ticket earning system, opportunities to purchase privileges, monthly Character Club meetings.

Person Responsible: Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

- Monthly newsletters providing updates, information and celebrations.

Person Responsible: Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

• Clubs and organizations for students to promote excellence, such as Little Tutors, Coding Club, STEM clubs and Junior National Honor Society.

Person Responsible: Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

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).

Funding allocation decisions are made collaboratively with all school stakeholders. The School Based Leadership Team reviews data to determine student and staff needs. Recommendations are discussed and considered with all groups including grade level teams, grade level team leaders, Parent/Teacher Association, School Advisory Council.

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

Our area of focus is implementing standards-aligned, rigorous instruction that enriches student learning, using formative assessments to monitor student progress and provide high-quality feedback and differentiated support, and increasing high-level academic discussions among and between students by developing benchmark aligned questions in order to deepen the students' understanding of the content presented.

The percentage of students who scored below the 40th percentile on the 2023 ELA assessment is:

Kindergarten-29%

First Grade-37%

Second Grade-48%

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

Our area of focus is implementing standards-aligned, rigorous instruction that enriches student learning, using formative assessments to monitor student progress and provide high-quality feedback and differentiated support, and increasing high-level academic discussions among and between students by developing benchmark aligned questions in order to deepen the students' understanding of the content presented.

The percentage of students who scored below a Level 3 on the 2023 ELA assessment is:

Third Grade-60%

Fourth Grade-54%

Fifth Grade-29%

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 scoring above the 40th percentile on the ELA assessment will increase to 75% in Kindergarten, 65% in First Grade and 63% in Second Grade.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Student Proficiency in the FAST ELA Assessment will increase to 63% in grades 3 and 4 and be above 63% in grade 5.

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.

Administrative walkthroughs with observational feedback will be utilized to monitor implementation and allocate resources to best meet staff needs. Data analysis meetings will be held regularly to review progress. The school-based leadership team will action plan and make adjustments and improvements in allocation of resources to best meet students' needs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Cook, Kim, cookkim@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?

The following evidence-based practices will be implemented:

- Collaborative PLC's
- Instructional Coaching
- Planning with Standards Aligned Instruction
- Differentiated Student Learning
- Small Group Instruction
- Academic Discussions among Students

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?

The rationale for choosing these practices is the high impact that these practices will have on improving reading instruction and student achievement in reading. According to the work of Douglas Fisher, Nancy Frey, and John Hattie the practices we have chosen to increase reading proficiency have the following effect size:

Planning with Standards Aligned Instruction-effect size-.75

Instructional Coaching-effect size-.88

Coaching towards Differentiation-effect size-1.29

Academic Discussions-effect size-.82

Small Group Instruction-effect size-.49

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
Small group differentiated instruction will be provided by a certified teacher for students who need intensive intervention in the area of reading.	Cook, Kim, cookkim@pcsb.org
District Support Staff will meet biweekly to provide coaching support, coteach or model lessons and provide support to the classroom teachers in planning lessons that are standards-aligned and rigorous.	Cook, Kim, cookkim@pcsb.org
Professional Development will be offered in the area of Best Practices for Reading Instruction and Standards Aligned Instruction.	Cook, Kim, cookkim@pcsb.org
Each grade level will have an ELA champion who will serve in a leadership role as a liaison between the school district ELA department and their grade level team.	Saccasyn, Thea, saccasynt@pcsb.org

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 school utilizes multiple methods to communicate with families, staff and stakeholders:

- *Monthly newsletters
- *Monthly family events: Reading Under the Stars, Arts Night, Math Mac and Cheese, Student Led Conferences
- *Email distribution
- *School Messenger
- *School Community Liaison
- *School social media: webpage, Facebook

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))

The school builds relationships through frequent contact:

- *Teacher/parent conferences
- *Implementation of Restorative Practices throughout campus
- *Family Engagement Plan available at <https://www.pcsb.org/tarpon-es>

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))

Continued and differentiated professional development will be offered to staff based on need to staff and students. Teachers will attend District Wide Training, and administrators will attend monthly curriculum meetings. Administrative observational feedback will be provided to strengthen teacher practice. Teachers will participate in PLCs to collaborate and improve practices.

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

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The school hosts a First Mates staff mentoring program where staff members are matched with students as a mentor. Additionally, the school has a social worker on staff four days a week, as well as a psychologist three days a week and a guidance counselor five days per week providing services to students.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

An Multi-tiered System of Support is implemented by the MTSS team. This team meets each quarter with teams to review data and make plans for instruction. The school based leadership team meets biweekly to review individual and schoolwide data and pursue services for students identified in need.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Teachers attend professional development both on site and at the district level.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Preschool students are supported at the school by participating in school wide events. Our preschool classrooms are in the kindergarten pod and staff and students interact in the pod and on the playground. PreK families are included in all events.

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				\$276,600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	0120	4491 - Tarpon Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$170,966.29
			Notes: Two intervention teachers to supplement tier 1 services and provide tier 2 and tier 3 services to students.			
	5100	0150	4491 - Tarpon Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$11,431.00
			Notes: One paraprofessional to supplement tier 1 services and provide tier 2 services to students.			
	5100	0510	4491 - Tarpon Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$745.26
			Notes: Instructional materials to supplement instructional.			
	5100	0530	4491 - Tarpon Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$500.00
			Notes: Subscription to Planbook.com for each teacher for structured lesson planning.			
	6400	0130	4491 - Tarpon Springs Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$92,957.45
			Notes: One MTSS coach to analyze data, support teachers and assure student needs are being met.			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$0.00
Total:						\$276,600.00

Budget Approval

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

No