

Pinellas County Schools

Gulf Beaches Elementary Magnet 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	29
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Gulf Beaches Elementary Magnet School

8600 BOCA CIEGA DR, St. Petersburg, FL 33706

<http://www.beaches-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.

Our mission at Gulf Beaches Elementary Magnet School is to foster an innovator's mindset and a foundation for high academic achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspiring a community of innovative, productive and successful lifelong learners.

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
Kalach, Robert	Principal	Provide for the administration of the school (As noted in the PCS Job Description for Elementary School Principal).

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.

Each school year, GBEMS involves the whole Staff, advertises and recruits volunteers from the school community (Parents, Community Memembers, and Business Partners) to provide input, review and to monitor the SIP from inception through to the close of the school year.

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))

As a school staff, the plan is routinely referred to as a guidance document to focus the resources of all stakeholders. The Action Steps of the plan are also reviewed/revise on an ongoing basis to ensure the greatest return on investment.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	38%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
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	9	5	6	10	8	0	0	0	38	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	7	4	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	2	1	0	0	0	8	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	4	

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

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

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	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) 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	7	7	10	12	8	0	0	0	44	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	4	8	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	7	10	12	8	0	0	0	44	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	4	8	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	4	

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	66	54	53	74	55	56	71		
ELA Learning Gains				76			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				71			55		
Math Achievement*	76	61	59	83	51	50	78		
Math Learning Gains				82			78		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				70			55		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	84	62	54	83	62	59	79		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		64	59						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	287
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	539
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	66			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	56			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	66			

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	56			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	78			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	79			

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	66			76			84					
SWD	56			75							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47			65							2	
MUL	50			75							2	
PAC												
WHT	71			78			83				4	
FRL	57			68			80				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	74	76	71	83	82	70	83					
SWD	43	57		57	67							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	74	93		84	57		82					
MUL				80								
PAC												
WHT	75	72	56	83	86	80	83					
FRL	72	71		83	84	70	95					

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	71	69	55	78	78	55	79					
SWD	50			58								
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												
HSP	58			74								
MUL	64			80								
PAC												
WHT	75	74		79	76		78					
FRL	73	64		69	64		67					

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	71%	57%	14%	54%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	58%	18%	58%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	53%	6%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	61%	62%	-1%	59%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	83%	66%	17%	61%	22%
05	2023 - Spring	88%	61%	27%	55%	33%

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

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA in PM3 showed a proficiency rate of 69% compared to the 2021-2022 school year with 74% proficiency. Looking at grade level areas of proficiency in ELA, 3rd grade posted only 59% proficient. While the assessment was change from FSA to BEST standards, the student population had been exposed in grades 1st and 2nd to BEST standards.

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

Greatest decline in proficiency rate from 2021-2022 to the 2022-2023 data was in ELA. Based on 3rd grade's percentage of students who were proficient (59%) definitely factors into the decline from 74%.

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 data showed that we as a school were above state average in ELA, Math, and Science.

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

5th grade Science improved by 1% from 83% proficiency in 2021-2022 to 84% proficiency in 2022-2023. Focus around science with 1/3 of grade cell being imperative. While our students do tend to lead in science proficiency, we continue to incorporate cross- curricular instruction.

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

SWD is always an area of importance for us. Our trends show that identifying students with large gaps are found in 2nd and 3rd grade. This presents a challenge to closing the gaps as well as identifying specific interventions and or disabilities. Identifying students prior to 3rd grade with more specific data is an area of work.

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

Incoming 4th grade ELA - identifying the needs of 49% non-proficient students while maintaining/ accelerating those of proficiency.

SWD as well as identifying students with academic needs earlier to close gaps and move towards proficiency.

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 Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

In order for our students to maintain and meet our goal of 80% proficient, a deeper understanding of the Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards for Mathematics is critical and a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

80% or more of all students will demonstrate proficiency in grade level Mathematics expectations as assessed through the district/state Progress Monitoring 3.

Monitoring:

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

Teacher lesson plans, classroom observations, participation in Professional Learning Communities (Grade Level and Schoolwide), student performance data results relating to demonstrating Mathematics proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Kalach (kalachr@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.)

The use of Dreambox, Ignite, and district provided math interventions to establish mathematical goals that focus learning through student specific data and needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Shifting from simply stating a standard to communicating learning expectations ensures that goals are appropriate, challenging, and attainable. When goals are specific, revisited throughout the lesson and connect to other mathematics, they become clearer to students. Effective teaching of mathematics establishes clear goals for the mathematics students are learning, situates goals within learning progressions, and uses the goals to inform instructional decisions.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers and administrators engage in Collaborative Planning (during or after school) utilizing the Best Instructional Guide to Mathematics (B1G-M) to support Implementation of the B.E.S.T. Standards and

other instructional initiatives to analyze the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

Person Responsible: Robert Kalach (kalachr@pcsb.org)

By When: 8/23 to 5/24

No description entered

Person Responsible: Robert Kalach (kalachr@pcsb.org)

By When:

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

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

Monitor whole and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principals.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Meet and maintain proficiency through intentional standard based instruction designed around students need using the deep understanding of the standards along with district provided supports.

Monitoring:

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

Observations, data tracking, intervention tracking, and students' progress towards proficiency, as well as maintaining proficiency by Progress Monitoring 3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Kalach (kalachr@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.)

Use and connect mathematical representations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective teaching of mathematics engages students in making connections among mathematical representations to deepen understanding of mathematics concepts and procedures and as tools for problem solving.

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

Person Responsible: Robert Kalach (kalachr@pcsb.org)

By When: 8/10-5/24

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

Person Responsible: Robert Kalach (kalachr@pcsb.org)

By When: 8/10-5/24

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

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

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

Deepen understanding of the Florida's B.E.S.T. ELA standards and benchmarks as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes to increase student proficiency by Progress Monitoring 3 to 80% or higher. As teachers become more skilled in unpacking and understanding the standards, there will be evidence of changes in students' abilities to process and understand new content. Teachers will be able to identify which content is critical and understand how learned content scaffolds in complexity.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency of 80% or higher of students meeting proficiency by Progress Monitoring 3.

Monitoring:

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

Continued and ongoing progress monitoring through observations, ELFAC, module assessments, entry/exit tickets, Istation, STAR data, running records, and teacher designed standard proficiency monitoring of standards throughout modules.

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.)

Identifying critical content based on student data and need to stack standards and benchmarks for supporting student learning. Interventions will include Istation, Flamingo, UFLI, JR, Phonics, and explicit differentiation of standards and benchmarks to meet students' needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using data to drive the areas of instruction to either close gaps or accelerate the learning will ensure students' progress towards proficiency of grade level standards.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Use district PCS Modules curriculum to provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content, knowledge-building, and tasks aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark; and make strategic decisions about implementation of the curriculum to maximize impact on student learning.

Person Responsible: Robert Kalach (kalachr@pcsb.org)

By When: 8/10-5/24

Continue to deepen understanding of the vertical progression and standards design in order to understand what students are expected to master.

Person Responsible: Robert Kalach (kalachr@pcsb.org)

By When: 8/10-5/24

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

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

Utilizing the district science curriculum materials and supports to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students. Streamlining the curriculum K-5 ensures that students gain knowledge and foundations of science standards as they progress each year and allows for deep understanding and improving proficiency by grade 5.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Maintain or exceed 80% proficiency of 5th graders on end of the year State Science Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Data monitoring with collection of district science provided assessments including unit, observations, maintaining and staying on pace, utilizing labs to connect standards and learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Kalach (kalachr@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.)

Planning and predicting using ongoing assessment and feedback of data to implement intentional lessons that meet the needs of all students. PLC conversations/collaborative planning to happen especially in 4th and 5th grade, as our curriculum format has changed. Teachers will need time to review/digest before determining how to present it to students. Embedding the review standards more purposefully may be new to teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It is imperative that there is intention planning and the use of time to determine how students are going to perform and what they will need to perform well.

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.

During collaborative planning that occurs within school hours or after-school planning sessions, make strategic decisions about implementation of the curriculum to maximize impact on student learning, including, but not limited to common planning, materials management, and use of collaborative structures for high-level engagement tasks.

Person Responsible: Robert Kalach (kalachr@pcsb.org)

By When: 05/24

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**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.

Ensuring whole group and small group instruction in the ELA, Math, and Science block is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

Measurable Outcome:

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

80% or more students will meet proficiency during the Progress Monitoring 3 assessment as well as 5th Grade SSA showing that whole group and small group instruction is closing gaps and/or accelerating students learning.

Monitoring:

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

Continued and ongoing progress monitoring through observations, ELFAC, module assessments, entry/exit tickets, Istation, Dreambox, STAR data, running records, and teacher designed standard proficiency monitoring of standards throughout instruction.

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.)

Scaffolding instruction based on student(s) need, explicit and systematic instruction, feedback, and differentiated instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Direct, explicit instruction is more effective and more efficient than partial guidance. Teachers are more effective when providing explicit guidance with practice and feedback rather than requiring student discovery while learning a new skill or concept. Differentiation helps students achieve more and feel more engaged.

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 support and feedback focused on explicit, systematic and sequential approaches to reading and writing instruction including a gradual release of responsibility model of instruction.

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/

more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.

Person Responsible: Robert Kalach (kalachr@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#6. 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.

Ongoing development and refinement of the "Innovation" theme concept with the implementation of Creativity and Innovation will continue to allow for higher student engagement as well as providing experiences that allows our students to create their own unique ideas and products while maintaining high engagement and achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Develop project-based learning (PBL) activities that encompass our districts BEST standards and curriculum.

Utilize innovation process and pillars of innovation (Confident Collaborators, Curious Questioners, Persevering Problem Solver, and Resilient Reflectors) to develop curriculum framework.

Provide and participate in professional development lessons/framework.

Monitoring:

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

Implementation and participation in the planned school based professional development trainings. Creation of structured/BEST & NGSS Standards based lesson plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Kalach (kalachr@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.)

Standard-based instruction with the implementation of Creativity and Innovation allows for higher student engagement as well as providing experiences that allow our students to create their own unique ideas and products while maintaining high engagement/achievement. Aligning and strategically planning the B.E.S.T and NGSS Standards to higher engagement will ensure equitable supports to all students with common foundation to meet the magnet focus of Innovation and Digital Learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing the current BEST and NGSS standards while implementing magnet theme of creativity and innovating learners. Teachers/staff will create and develop lessons and curriculum that incorporates high engaging project based learning projects, meaningful original student created work, analyzing trends, applying relevant digital tools when appropriate all while reflecting on creative and innovative processes.

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.

Innovation Team continue to refine and reflect the vision and mission around the innovation theme.

Meet monthly.

Research and share best practice with whole staff during scheduled innovation PD meeting sessions- 2 hours

Creation of sample lesson plans

Procurement resources, materials, and additional professional development

Person Responsible: Robert Kalach (kalachr@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Implement a Gifted Program to provides services that meet the needs of gifted students based on their Education Plans and the Florida Framework for Gifted Learners to ensure academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our current levels of performance for the gifted learners at Gulf Beaches Elementary Magnet are: 70% of our gifted learners scored a level 4 or 5 in ELA as evidenced by FAST 2023. 66% of our gifted learners scored a level 4 or 5 in Math as evidenced by FAST 2023.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring academic growth of all learners with regards to BEST Standards and action plan for scaffolded support or enrichment/extension as needed to ensure continuous engagement and academic growth of all students through standards based classroom assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Kalach (kalachr@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Utilize high yield questioning strategies such as starting with "the most difficult" questions first, strengthening differentiating by moving beyond just adapting content, product or process, to focus on differentiating the thinking skill.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implementing a Gifted Program to provides services that meet the needs of gifted students based on their Education Plans and The Florida Framework for Gifted Learners to ensure academic success.

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.

To address these gaps, our school would like to focus on the following strategy: Implement a Gifted Program to provides services that meet the needs of gifted students based on their Education Plans and The Florida Framework for Gifted Learners to ensure academic success. To support these strategies, our school would like to include the following action steps: utilizing the Gifted Canvas Curriculum Hub creating support plan for gifted students who are struggling academically, behaviorally or emotionally creating a gifted schedule (daily and weekly) that capitalizes on student contact time and allows for collaboration

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:**#8. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement****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.

Providing students opportunities for remediation and acceleration through before and after school activities. Programs include but not limited to extended learning, IC3 certification, STEM, Music, Dell certification, and creation of other programs based on stakeholder need and desire.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student and stakeholder recruitment and retainment.

Monitoring:

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

Student and stakeholder enjoyment and desire for programs/activities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Kalach (kalachr@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.)

Student engagement through the before and after school programs linked to student progress and achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Giving students opportunities to engage and participate in activities of want and need to promote a well-rounded program that engages and strives for all stakeholder success.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.

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: Math	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
7	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Other	\$0.00
8	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$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.

Yes