

Martin County School District

Port Salerno 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	27
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	28
VI. Title I Requirements	30
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	31

Port Salerno Elementary School

3260 SE LIONEL TER, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/pses

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Martin County School Board on 9/19/2023.

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.

Consistency, Communication, and Collaboration

Martin County School District mission: Educating all students for success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Creating an empowered community where all students are educated for social and academic success.

Martin County School District vision: A dynamic educational system of excellence.

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
Gifford, Lauren	Principal	Uphold the vision and mission of the school. Provide the expectation for increasing student achievement in core content areas and subgroups. Help guide and monitor teacher teams to look at school, grade level, and individual student data trends and implement plans of action to address students' academic needs.
Shaffer, David	Assistant Principal	Support the principal in the following areas: Uphold the vision and mission of the school. Provide the expectation for increasing student achievement in core content areas and subgroups. Help guide and monitor teacher teams to look at school, grade level, and individual student data trends and implement plans of action to address students' academic needs.
Bagley, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Support the principal in the following areas: Uphold the vision and mission of the school. Provide the expectation for increasing student achievement in core content areas and subgroups. Help guide and monitor teacher teams to look at school, grade level, and individual student data trends and implement plans of action to address students' academic needs.
Drake, Jessica	Math Coach	Implement full coaching cycles for strategic instructional support as tied to our school look-fors to bolster student achievement.
Gumbinner, Diane	School Counselor	Support students with skill and strategy supports to aid their success in the classroom. Align families with community resources.
Wardle, Diane	Staffing Specialist	Support ESE support facilitators and families with designing and implementing specific academic goals for students to aid their success in the classroom. Align ESE families with available supports and resources.
Gonzalez, Alcira	Other	Implement full coaching cycles for strategic instructional support as tied to our school look-fors to bolster student achievement for ELL's.

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 Leadership team completes a data review and root cause analysis when new data is available. New goals are drafted or revised and then shared with the faculty and SIP committee teams go through the same process to make revisions. Other stakeholder groups provided input via the UChicago 5 Essentials Survey- This included students and parents. This data is shared with leadership team and full faculty and staff to weave into the SIP.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP serves as the guiding compass for all school initiatives. Additionally, our school has developed school wide look fors that align with SIP goals. These look fors allow the Leadership Team and instructional staff to receive feedback and support in order to continually strengthen the SIP process. PSE also receives monthly school site visits with district staff that walk classrooms using the same look fors capturing schoolwide patterns for actionable feedback and shifts. All data is made transparent to staff, and these trends help support the need for reflections and actionable adjustments in the SIP plan.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	87%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D 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	33	41	27	48	14	27	0	0	0	190	
One or more suspensions	5	1	2	13	7	16	0	0	0	44	
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	36	13	60	0	0	0	109	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	27	59	0	0	0	114	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	6	11	22	5	6	0	0	0	54	

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	3	7	3	25	11	25	0	0	0	74

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	32	1	0	0	0	0	33
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	15	21	20	29	14	17	0	0	0	116	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	12	63	0	0	0	112	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	26	63	0	0	0	117	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	4	16	0	2	0	0	0	22	
	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	4	28	14	63	0	0	0	109

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	37	0	0	0	0	0	37
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	15	21	20	29	14	17	0	0	0	116	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	12	63	0	0	0	112	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	26	63	0	0	0	117	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	4	16	0	2	0	0	0	22	
	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	4	28	14	63	0	0	0	109

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	37	0	0	0	0	0	37
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*	34	55	53	31	53	56	30		
ELA Learning Gains				49			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			55		
Math Achievement*	45	62	59	30	43	50	28		
Math Learning Gains				36			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				25			38		
Science Achievement*	37	55	54	16	54	59	19		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	58	53	59	54			61		

** 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	204
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	285
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	27	Yes	4	2
ELL	34	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	38	Yes	2	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	38	Yes	2	

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	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	32	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	3	
HSP	35	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	38	Yes	1	
FRL	35	Yes	1	

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	34			45			37					58
SWD	20			29			20				5	53
ELL	24			39			25				5	58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			45			55				3	
HSP	30			42			32				5	57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	55			53			54				4	
FRL	31			45			37				5	53

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	31	49	44	30	36	25	16					54
SWD	16	38	50	26	19	20	4					49
ELL	20	43	45	23	34	31	9					54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	47		45	38		20					
HSP	29	48	45	26	35	29	14					54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	41	54		36	36		24					
FRL	32	49	42	29	35	19	17					55

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	30	50	55	28	44	38	19					61
SWD	19	44		24	33		6					48
ELL	23	46	54	23	44	35	12					61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			32								
HSP	28	48	54	26	43	37	16					61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	47			33								
FRL	29	53	55	28	48	40	15					62

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	27%	53%	-26%	54%	-27%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	66%	-14%	58%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	29%	51%	-22%	50%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	46%	62%	-16%	59%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	71%	-10%	61%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	32%	56%	-24%	55%	-23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	34%	50%	-16%	51%	-17%

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.

Which data component showed the lowest performance?

Grade 3 ELA proficiency numbers are not within reach of Tier 1 Exit status

Grade 5 ELA proficiency numbers are not within reach of Tier 1 Exit status

Grade 5 Science proficiency numbers are not within reach of Tier 1 Exit status

Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Need to strengthen student engagement to support student understanding of Benchmarks

Need to strengthen use of ELL strategies based on individual student need

Absence of coaching support/vacant positions

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

Having moved from FSA to the FAST assessment, it is difficult to compare two different assessments.

When looking at overall proficiency for ELA, Math, and Science- PSE did increase overall proficiency in

grades 3-5 in all areas.
ELA 31% to 34% proficiency
MATH 30% to 44% proficiency
SCIENCE from 16% to 34% proficiency

However, when looking at 3rd grade ELA proficiency only there was a drop from 31% to 29%.

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.

ELA 3rd grade proficiency was 29% versus the state average at 50%
ELA 5th grade proficiency was 27% versus the state average at 54%
MATH 5th grade proficiency was 32% versus the state average at 55%
SCIENCE proficiency was 34% versus the state average at 51%

Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Need to strengthen student engagement to support student understanding of Benchmarks
Need to strengthen small group differentiated instruction

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

Change in proficiency from PM1- PM3 for grades 3 and 4 for ELA:
Grade 3 ELA data on PM1 was 6% on or above grade level and increased to 29% on or above grade level for PM3
Grade 4 ELA data on PM1 was 14% proficient and increased to 52% on or above grade level for PM3
Grade 4 proficiency for PM3 was 52% for ELA and 62% for MATH
Grade 4 support class MATH proficiency was in the 70% percentile for PM3
Grade 3 retainee class MATH proficiency for the two classes was 75% and 81% for PM3
Grade 3 MATH proficiency was 47% for PM3
Grade 5 FSSA proficiency increased from 15% in 21/22 SY to 34% in 22/23

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

Overall attendance is an area of concern.

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

Maximizing the PLC's around the PLC 4 essential questions. Teachers coming prepared in advance of the PLC with an understanding of the Benchmark, and effective differentiation of instruction based upon common formative assessments.

Ongoing rigorous PD through Instructional Empowerment around engagement strategies to support student understanding of the Benchmarks. There is still too much heavy lifting by teachers and student compliance versus student engagement.

Implementing Systems to strengthen coaching through the use of BSI Coaching logs/ Instructional Empowerment's Coaching tool.

Increasing student achievement to a minimum of 41% proficiency in all tested content areas in order to exit Tier 1

Increasing student proficiency for ESE and ELL students

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

As a BSI Tier 1 school, consistency and sustainability to the instructional staff and student environment is paramount in continuing to make progress and build on the prior year's learning and development.

Measurable Outcome:

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

UChicago 5 Essentials Staff Survey in Spring of 2023 yielded:

Collective Responsibility Measure under the Essential Collaborative Teachers needs to be addressed for improvement.

Only 41% responded that nearly all are responsible for improving the school

Only 44% said nearly all felt responsible for everyone to do their best

Only 56% felt responsible that all students learn

Domain will increase from an mScore of 32 (weak) to and mScore of 52 (strong) by the spring of 2024

Monitoring:

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

UChicago 5 Essentials Staff Survey comparative data from the prior year will be analyzed in the domain of "Collaborative Teachers."

Based on a comparison to the benchmark, an mScore of 32 means that PSE is weak on this measure (weak).

Only 41% responded that nearly all are responsible for improving the school.

Only 44% said nearly all felt responsible for everyone to do their best.

Only 56% felt responsible that all students learn.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Gifford (giffordl@martin.k12.fl.us)

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 conduct a root cause analysis and planning packet to answer the question of "why did we get these results for our prioritized measure for growth?"

Teachers will articulate a mutual vision to improve in conjunction with school improvement goals to improve this measure of growth.

Leadership team will complete the 5 Essentials Implementation Action Plan to enact change.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In schools with a strong collective responsibility, teachers share a strong sense of responsibility for student development, school improvement, and professional growth.

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.

Teacher teams will conduct a root cause analysis together in the 5E's planning packet to answer the question of "Why did we get these results for our prioritized measure for growth?"

Person Responsible: Lauren Gifford (gifforl@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 3rd, 2023

Teachers will articulate a mutual vision to improve in conjunction with school improvement goals to improve this measure of growth by spring 2024.

Person Responsible: Lauren Gifford (gifforl@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 15th, 2023

Leadership team will complete the 5 Essentials Implementation Action Plan to enact change.

Person Responsible: Lauren Gifford (gifforl@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 15th, 2023

Providing opportunities for teachers to attend PD off campus together to learn, collaborate, share with teams and staff, and observe others implementing strategies learned in classrooms.

Person Responsible: Lauren Gifford (gifforl@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 23-24 school year

#2. 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.

Based on 22-23 walkthrough data related to the domain of student engagement yielded a need to shift from compliance to active academic engagement linked to the benchmark.

During the 2022-23 SY, the following subgroups underperformed on FAST PM3:

ESE students underperformed when compared to their non-ESE peers. Overall, our 3rd - 5th grade ESE students scored 11% proficient in ELA and 23% proficient in Math.

3rd through 5th grade ELL students scored at 23% proficient in ELA and 38% proficient in math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA, Math, and Science proficiency for grades 3,4, & 5 will be at 50% proficiency or higher on FAST PM3.

For the 2023-24 SY, by FAST PM3, our grade 3-5 ESE students will score 30% proficient in ELA and 41% proficient in Math.

For the 2023-24 SY, by FAST PM3, our grade 3-5 ELL students will score 41% proficient in ELA and 50% proficient in Math.

Monitoring:

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

ELA and Math Proficiency for grades 3-5 will be a minimum proficiency by FAST PM2.

ELA and Math proficiency by FAST PM2 for grades 3-5 ESE and ELL students will increase by a minimum of 15% proficiency when compared to PM1.

Using our walkthrough tool, specifically focused on differentiated instruction we will monitor look for data based upon quarterly goals. Baseline data will be collected within this domain in September and the percentage should increase quarterly.

The Leadership team will coach and monitor the planning for differentiated small group instruction during PLCs to provide feedback on effectiveness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Bagley (bagleyn@martin.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Professional development through Instructional Empowerment with a focus on student teaming, (student engagement).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Hattie's research Professional Development has a .51 effect size, which is in the zone of desired effects.

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?

Yes

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.

Ongoing for the 23-24 school year professional development centered around student teaming (student engagement) through Instructional Empowerment professional development.

Person Responsible: Nicole Bagley (bagleyn@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

Ongoing classroom coaching following professional development with Instructional Empowerment.

Person Responsible: Lauren Gifford (giffordl@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

Weekly walkthroughs by leadership team, district staff, and state walks to capture look for data trends in the domain of student engagement.

Person Responsible: David Shaffer (shaffed@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 23-24 school year

Quarterly AVID site team planning around WICOR instructional strategies and planning for implementation.

Person Responsible: Nicole Bagley (bagleyn@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly throughout the 23-24 school year.

Plan in-school and out of school-academically tied field trips to enhance understanding of the Benchmarks through hands on, interactive experiences. These academic trips will be used to impact student achievement. The field trips help build background knowledge and vocabulary that tie into current Benchmark Advanced Science themes as well as Science standards to support growth in ELA and Science. The following field trips are planned for the 2023-2024 school year. Childrens Museum (SC.K.P.8.1 MAFS.K.G.2.5 MAFS.K.CC.2.4; Palm Beach Zoo (SC.K.N.1.1.,SC.K.L.14.1, SC.K.L.14.2, SC.K.L.14.3);Oceanographic Center (SC.2.L.17.2,SC.2.L.14.1,SC.2.L.17.2,SC.2.L.14.1,S .2.L.16.1,SC.2.L.17.1) Oxbow Eco Center Port St. Lucie (SC.4.L.16.3,SC.4.L.17)Ocean Discovery program @ Seaworld, Orlando (fifth grade only); SC.5.L. 14.2, SC.5.L.17.1,SC.5.L15,SC.N.1.1,SC5.N.1.2,SC5.N.1.3

Person Responsible: David Shaffer (shaffed@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 23-24 school year

#3. 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.

Grade 3 ELA proficiency is not within reach of Tier 1 exit status

Grade 5 ELA proficiency numbers are not within reach of Tier 1 exit status

Grade 5 Science proficiency numbers are not within reach of Tier 1 exit status

ELA 3rd grade proficiency was 29% versus the state average at 50%

ELA 5th grade proficiency was 27% versus the state average at 54%

MATH 5th grade proficiency was 32% versus the state average at 55%

SCIENCE proficiency was 34% versus the state average at 51%

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA, Math, and Science proficiency for grades 3,4, & 5 will be at 50% proficiency or higher on FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

ELA, MATH and SCIENCE proficiency for grades 3,4,& 5 will be at a minimum of 41% proficiency on FAST PM2.

Using our walkthrough tool, we will monitor look for data based upon quarterly goals. Baseline data will be collected within this domain in September and the percentage should increase quarterly.

The Leadership Team will monitor qualitative aspects of the function of the PLC to provide feedback on effectiveness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Gifford (giffordl@martin.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Professional Learning Communities focused upon benchmarks, target/task alignment, and differentiation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collective teacher efficacy is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. With an effective size $d = 1.57$ collective teacher efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement.

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.

Professional development MOI101 provided by Instructional Empowerment on the benchmark alignment to curriculum.

Person Responsible: David Shaffer (shaffed@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year

Weekly walkthroughs by leadership team, district staff, and state walks to capture look for data trends on identified look fors

Person Responsible: Lauren Gifford (gifforl@martin.k12.fl.us)

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

Quarterly professional development for Collaborative Data Liasons centered around the 4 essential PLC questions

Person Responsible: Nicole Bagley (bagleyn@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year

Leadership team members in attendance during Professional Learning Communities weekly in order to provide feedback for effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Lauren Gifford (gifforl@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year

Addition of an Instructional Science Coach/Interventionist to support grades 3-5 science

Person Responsible: Lauren Gifford (gifforl@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing for the 23-24SY

Utilize Title 1 and UniSIG funds to support instructional coaches (science) and two interventionists (math) in the content areas

Person Responsible: Lauren Gifford (gifforl@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing for the 23-24SY

Utilize UniSIG funds to pay for additional PLC planning time around the Benchmarks for grade level teams

Person Responsible: Lauren Gifford (gifforl@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing for the 23-24SY

Spanish RA teacher to frontload vocab/background through the realia bins that correspond with Benchmark Advanced ELA units.

Person Responsible: Alcira Gonzalez (gonzala@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing through the 23-24 school year

#4. 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.

During the 2022-23 SY, the following subgroups underperformed on FAST PM3:

ESE students underperformed when compared to their non-ESE peers. Overall, our 3rd - 5th grade ESE students scored 11% proficient in ELA and 23% proficient in Math.

Grade 3:

ELA ESE Proficiency: 10% level 3 or higher (29 total ESE students)

Math ESE Proficiency: 27% level 3 or higher (29 total ESE students)

Grade 4:

ELA ESE Proficiency: 24% level 3 or higher (8 total ESE students)

Math ESE Proficiency: 62% level 3 or higher (8 total ESE students)

Grade 5:

ELA ESE Proficiency: 8% level 3 or higher (26 total ESE students)

Math ESE Proficiency: 4% level 3 or higher (25 total ESE students)

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023-24 SY, by FAST PM3, our grade 3-5 ESE students will score 30% proficient in ELA and 41% proficient in Math.

Monitoring:

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

ELA and Math proficiency by FAST PM2 for grades 3-5 ESE students will increase by a minimum of 15% proficiency when compared to PM1 on assessed Benchmarks.

Using our walkthrough tool, specifically focused on differentiated instruction we will monitor look for data based upon quarterly goals. Baseline data will be collected within this domain in September and the percentage should increase quarterly.

The Leadership team will coach and monitor the planning for differentiated small group instruction during PLCs to provide feedback on effectiveness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Gifford (giffordl@martin.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Professional Learning Communities focused upon benchmarks, target/task alignment, and differentiation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collective teacher efficacy is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. With an effective size $d = 1.57$ collective teacher efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement.

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.

Monthly ESE PLC for support facilitators with ESE Specialist and instructional coaches to conduct data review and progress monitor student performance

Person Responsible: Diane Wardle (wardled@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing throughout the 23-24SY

Coaching support from district ESE coaches to implement coaching cycle and feedback for ESE support facilitators

Person Responsible: Diane Wardle (wardled@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing for the 23-24 school year

Coaching support from district ESE coaches to implement coaching cycle and feedback for ESE support facilitators

Person Responsible: Diane Wardle (wardled@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing for the 23-24 school year

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

Based on 22-23 walkthrough data related to the domain of student engagement yielded a need to shift from compliance to active academic engagement linked to the benchmark.

During the 2022-23 SY, the following subgroup underperformed on FAST PM3:

3rd through 5th grade ELL students scored at 23% proficient in ELA and 38% proficient in math.

GR3 ELA – ELL: 0% proficient (22 students)

GR4 ELA – ELL: 24% proficient (85 students)

GR5 ELA - ELL: 40% proficient (41 students)

GR3 Math – ELL: 0% proficient (10 students)

GR4 Math – ELL: 51% proficient (85 students)

GR5 Math - ELL: 54% proficient (41 students)

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023-24 SY, by FAST PM3, our grade 3-5 ELL students will score 41% proficient in ELA and 50% proficient in Math.

Monitoring:

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

ELA and Math proficiency by FAST PM2 for grades 3-5 ELL students will increase by a minimum of 15% proficiency when compared to PM1 on assessed Benchmarks.

Using our walkthrough tool, specifically focused on differentiated instruction we will monitor look for data based upon quarterly goals. Baseline data will be collected within this domain in September and the percentage should increase quarterly.

The Leadership team will coach and monitor the planning for differentiated small group instruction during PLCs to provide feedback on effectiveness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alcira Gonzalez (gonzala@martinschools.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.)

Professional development through Ellevation with a focus on student engagement and scaffolds

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Hattie's research Professional Development has a .51 effect size, which is in the zone of desired effects. Additionally, as noted on the Regional Educational Laboratory Program webiste, What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guide for Teachers identifies four recommendations that address what works for English learners in the classroom (Baker et. al, 2014). These are also integrated into the

Ellevation PD.

They include:

Teach a set of academic vocabulary words intensively across several days using a variety of instructional activities.

Integrate oral and written English language instruction into content-area teaching.

Integrate oral and written English language instruction into content-area teaching.

Provide regular, structured opportunities to develop written language skills.

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.

Quarterly Professional development of a identified Pathway (Introduction to Develop Academic Language) and subsequent modules through the Ellevation platform tied to ELL's. Follow up PLC planning for implementation of strategies learned will also be required. This is documented in our quarterly action plans in digestable bites including :participating in the module online learning, followed but planning, teaching, and then debriefing using student artifacts at the PLC.

Person Responsible: Alcira Gonzalez (gonzala@martinschools.org)

By When: quarterly for the 23-24 school year

Coaching support from district ELL coaches to implement coaching cycle and feedback for teachers and ELL paras

Person Responsible: Alcira Gonzalez (gonzala@martinschools.org)

By When: ongoing for the 23-24 school year

Hiring of a TESOL certified teacher to provide targeted small group instruction with scaffolds for ELL students in grades 3-5

Person Responsible: Lauren Gifford (giffordl@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing for the 23-24 school year

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Schoolwide data was reviewed to analyze where the need was greatest. Additionally, the BSI Summer Academy had a heavy focus on coaching supports, so trying to fill critical coaching positions with available funding was priority. Collaboration with the Title 1 department and other district support staff was also helpful in aligning need.

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

Foundational reading skills are critical for students to solidify in order to prepare students to become proficient readers. Roughly 30% of incoming kindergarten students have not attended a Pre-K readiness program. Additionally, 60% of our student body is identified as ELL, and fall in the various stages of language acquisition. Foundational reading skills focused upon oral language, PA, and phonics are the pillars for reading achievement.

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

The work in PLC's is critical. Use of the "Gap Eliminator" form paired with data protocols, will guide instructional staff to analyze progress monitoring FAST data as well as formative data including Math Topic assessments, and Benchmark Unit and weekly assessments. Additionally, students falling in ESSA subgroups can also be monitored for adequate progress. Planning of rigorous, standards based instruction will occur in teams and guide the planning and monitoring of differentiated instruction/intervention.

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

ELA proficiency for grades K-2 will be at 50% proficiency or higher on STAR PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

ELA proficiency for grades 3,4, & 5 will be at 50% proficiency or higher on FAST PM3.

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.

Using our walkthrough tool, the school leadership team will monitor look for data based upon quarterly goals. Baseline data will be collected within this domain in September and the percentage should increase quarterly. Walks will be conducted weekly by the team and monthly with BSI and district staff.

The Leadership Team will monitor qualitative aspects of the function of the PLC to provide feedback on effectiveness.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Gifford, Lauren, giffordl@martin.k12.fl.us

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?

Consistent instruction across grade levels will occur to ensure that explicit, systematic, and multi-sensory instruction is occurring in phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and oral language. Implementation of the Florida Benchmark Advance curriculum will ensure teachers are connecting curriculum to BEST standards.

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?

Previous STAR and FAST data demonstrate students are not exiting prior grades with the minimum proficiency needed in order to bolster reading achievement. This is creating gaps that need to be closed in the next grade level. Students in grades K-5 must be at a minimum of 41% proficiency for ELA.

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
Initial and ongoing professional learning and support for effective implementation of Florida's Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) ELA Standards	Bacchiochi, Jennifer , bacchij@martin.k12.fl.us
Professional learning and support for literacy coaches	Blount, Shannon, blounts@martinschools.org
Professional learning and support for building capacity of school-level literacy leadership teams	Bacchiochi, Jennifer , bacchij@martin.k12.fl.us
PLC's with data analysis, subgroup monitoring, and planning for rigorous, standards based instruction two times weekly with support from school based/district based literacy coaches and the SRLD	Gifford, Lauren, gifforl@martin.k12.fl.us

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.

SIP and progress monitoring will be shared quarterly at SIP meetings. PSE's School Improvements Plan meetings are provided in-person and translated for all attendees speaking other languages. Parent meetings are also opportunities where school staff focus on strategies to bolster SIP goals and areas of focus.

Additionally, the SIP plan is provided in a language parents can understand through the following webpage as an additional measure of dissemination beyond in-person:

The PSE SIP plan will be posted to the PSE website at <https://www.martinschools.org/o/pses>. In addition, this will be shared at our SAC meetings.

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))

PSE 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. PSE will post their Family Engagement Plan on our school website at <https://www.martinschools.org/o/pse>. In addition, we have family engagements monthly and have contacted local businesses to create partnerships.

PFEP linked here:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1p0-4lHlK3ijYfGhj2OPHbn4CvJOMqqBqpJWqHxZAJKE/edit?usp=sharing>

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)

PSE plans to strengthen the academic program, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum by providing
Targeted afterschool tutoring with pre and post test data
Providing PD opportunities to lift student engagement (AVID)
Providing additional PLC planning time

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))

Port Salerno Elementary's plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as:

Title I Part A

Title III/ ELL

Title 9/ Homeless Families in Transition

PSE collaborates with Food and Nutrition Services and our district Head Start, and other community organizations that provide services and wrap around care for our students.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				\$20,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	330	0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	UniSIG		\$20,000.00

			Notes: Providing opportunities for teachers to attend PD off campus together to learn, collaborate, and share with teams and staff. I.E. NCTM National Expo, PLC's at work, WIDA National Conference AVID				
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement					\$40,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
	7800	330	0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	UniSIG		\$40,000.00	
			Notes: Plan in school and out of school-academically tied field trips to enhance understanding of the Benchmarks through hands on, interactive experiences.				
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction					\$245,191.20
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
	6100	130	0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	UniSIG	2.0	\$133,962.50	
			Notes: Two math intervention teachers base salary and benefits (\$66981.25. * 2)				
	6400	130	0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$65,863.00	
			Notes: 1 Instructional Coach/Interventionists to support upper-grade science. Base salary and benefits. (\$65,863.)				
	5100	510	0101 - Port Salerno Elementary School	UniSIG		\$45,365.70	
			Notes: Supplementary instructional materials to support content area vocabulary instruction. ELL cognates and materials to support language acquisition.				
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities					\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners					\$0.00
Total:						\$305,191.20	

Budget Approval

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

Yes