

Pinellas County Schools

Cross Bayou Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Cross Bayou Elementary School

6886 102ND AVE N, Pinellas Park, FL 33782

<http://www.crossbayou-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.

Cross Bayou Elementary will educate, engage and empower students for lifelong learning.

Our School Motto that students can say that supports our school mission is:

C - Care for Others

B - Be Responsible

E - Exhibit Perseverance

S - Show Respect

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilson, Antonette	Principal	Monitor implementation of SIP, lead PLC's and planning, reflect on improvement, provide feedback and next steps.
Stull, Eileen	Assistant Principal	Monitor implementation of SIP, lead PLC's and planning, reflect on improvement, provide feedback and next steps.
McClure, Rachel	Instructional Coach	Monitor implementation of SIP, lead PLC's and planning, reflect on improvement, provide feedback and next steps.

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.

Instructional staff members input in the core subjects: ELA, Math, Science and PBIS by identifying the vision and mission for each core subject area as well as defining at least one goal for students, teachers, and resources to be used.

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))

SIP Conversations are a part of CBES Meeting Map. Instructional staff members will engage in evident based conversations around goals and actions steps. These constant conversations will help us to PDSA our strategies leading up to the mid-year reflection.

Demographic Data

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	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	15	12	13	18	9	0	0	0	68	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	4	4	0	0	0	17	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	16	17	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	20	14	0	0	0	43	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	

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	8	14	7	0	0	0	30

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	1	6	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	22	19	36	11	11	0	0	0	100	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	13	0	0	0	0	31	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	15	3	2	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	33
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	1	22	19	36	11	11	0	0	0	100	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	13	0	0	0	0	31	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	15	3	2	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	33
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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	39	55	56	38	54	57
ELA Learning Gains	51	62	61	60	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46	55	52	51	54	53
Math Achievement*	44	62	60	53	61	63
Math Learning Gains	53	65	64	50	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35	54	55	29	48	51
Science Achievement*	48	57	51	39	53	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	58			78		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	29	Yes	3	2
HSP	48			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	44			

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)

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	39	51	46	44	53	35	48					58
SWD	20	50	45	21	39	36	38					
ELL	22	50		39	50		25					58
AMI												
ASN	75			81								
BLK	32	62		12	8							
HSP	41	48		48	54		40					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	33	47	50	42	57	57	53					
FRL	35	54	53	38	50	32	39					47

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	34	37	33	43	48	31	32					47
SWD	29	46		28	38		29					
ELL	22	46		38	54		23					47
AMI												
ASN	63			79								
BLK	0			6								
HSP	24			35								35
MUL	50			30								
PAC												
WHT	37	36	30	47	53		39					
FRL	27	28	27	37	36	25	18					44

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	38	60	51	53	50	29	39					78
SWD	19	24	17	31	31	36	7					
ELL	36	74		64	32		18					78
AMI												
ASN	57	73		81	45							83
BLK	22	30		32	43	30	8					
HSP	26	73	70	37	27		25					74
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	40	62	50	55	57	35	43					
FRL	28	57	57	46	46	25	31					75

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	44%	57%	-13%	54%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	58%	-21%	58%	-21%
03	2023 - Spring	33%	53%	-20%	50%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	62%	-19%	59%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	66%	-13%	61%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	36%	61%	-25%	55%	-19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	38%	60%	-22%	51%	-13%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Our lowest performance was 3rd grade ELA. We contribute this to our Tier 1 instructional focus.

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

When looking at the data we did not observe a significant decline in ELA and Math proficiency. However, science proficiency went from 48% to 38%, a 10% decline.

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 and Math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average.

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

Compared to PM 2 FAST data. Our PMS Data showed significant improvement. We contribute the actions to district level instructional coaches frequent and purposeful planning with kindergarten through fifth grade teacher and reverting to self-contained classes in 4th and 5th grade.

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

Our issues centered around tardiness and absences combined with the resources used with student during interventions.

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

Schoolwide focus on instructional planning
Intentionally plan for differentiation
Planning for ways to monitor learning
Engineer lessons for deeper learning

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 Professional Learning Communities**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.

The 2022-2023 FAST results were based on student proficiency. At Cross Bayou our proficiency scores for our 3rd - 5th grade students were as follows: ELA 39% proficient, Math 44% proficient, and Science 38% proficient. This means 33% of our 4th grade students are proficient in ELA and 37% of our 5th graders are proficient in ELA, 43% of our 4th grades are proficient in math, and 53% of our 5th grades are proficient in math. We often correlate ELA and science, with that correlation, 37% of our 5th grades are proficient in science. These data point are showing that on average more than 52% of our students are not proficient as measured by the Florida BEST Standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Cross Bayou plans to increase proficiency in ELA and Math by at least 12% in ELA, Math, and Science.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by grade levels focusing on pedagogy (how teachers teach) what they do, what they ask their students to do, and the assignments/task that measure student learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@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.)

Creating a culture of effective learning communities which will actively encourage and support teachers to focus on activating prior knowledge, differentiation, address and plan for misconceptions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When teachers realize that effective learning communities main focus is not collaborative resourcing, and that it supports professional conversations between teachers to develop their subject knowledge and diversify their teaching methods. Then they will see student abilities to process and understand grade level content increase. (Although sharing and developing resources may emerge as a product of the discussions)

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.

When the staff has built shared knowledge and found common ground on these questions, then Cross Bayou will have a solid foundation for moving forward with our student improvement initiatives.

Four Questions:

What do we want students to learn?

How will we know when they have learned it?

How will we respond when they have not learned it?

How will we respond when they already know it?

Person Responsible: Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

Build a culture of collaboration. We will develop a process in which teachers work together to analyze and improve their classroom practice by engaging in an ongoing cycle of questions that promote deep team learning. This process, in turn, leads to higher levels of student achievement.

Person Responsible: Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

Participation in the MAST Institute. Math and Science Teacher Institute

Improve teacher pedagogy in math science and technology.

Person Responsible: Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

Facilitate collaboration and learning communities to focus on Instructional Support, Student Learning, and School Improvement.

Person Responsible: Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

By When: March 2024

#2. 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.

Our area of focus for Positive Culture and Environment will be to focus on our conditions for learning for all students with a specific focus on Students with Disabilities. Currently or SWD proficiency is below 41%, our attendance rate was below 95%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase conditions for learning focusing on creating classroom environments of trust, openness to dialogue, academic goal setting, and risk taking for all students.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through our schoolwide PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention and Support Model) via Class Dojo. Student data discussions and folders/charts.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Chrosniak (chrosniakj@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.)

Schoolwide Positive Behavior Intervention Support Model

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We want to create conditions for learning that will promote all student's growth with regards to goal setting and academic progress.

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.

Develop schoolwide process where 80% of class dojo points will be rewarded for behavior.

Person Responsible: Jessica Chrosniak (chrosniakj@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2024

Teachers will use class dojo with fidelity to support student behavior, celebrate success, and hold student accountable for their behavior and communicate with families.

Person Responsible: Jessica Chrosniak (chrosniakj@pcsb.org)

By When: October 2024

Develop schoolwide process where 80% of class dojo points will be rewarded for behavior.

Person Responsible: Jessica Chrosniak (chrosniakj@pcsb.org)

By When: February 2024

Teachers and student will document class dojo points in data binders.

Person Responsible: Jessica Chrosniak (chrosniakj@pcsb.org)

By When: February 2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

Less than 41% of our student in our multiple ESSA Subgroups showed proficiency in ELA and Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase our multiple subgroups proficiency levels by 15% in ELA and Math as measured by PM3 FAST Assessment and by 10% in science as measured by End of Year Science SSA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored by planning that focus on: What do we want students to learn? How will we know when they have learned it? How will we respond when they do not learn it? How will we respond when they already know it?

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@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.)

During the summer of 2023 or DHH Teacher (Robert) adjust the ELA Modules to ensure the DHH students are taught grade level standards and exposed to grade level text. These adjustments to the lesson will be implemented during the 2023-2024 school year during the ELA Core and Intervention Blocks. Our VE resource Teachers will use district curriculum as well as Specially Designed Instruction to instruct our student identified as ESE. Our black students will be monitored through our MTSS process and provided additional support in areas identified through on-going progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Direct and explicit instruction includes modeling of the skills along with guided practice until mastery is achieved. Direct explanations and clearly explained skills comprises explicit instruction; teachers, are clear, unambiguous, direct, and visible until student meet mastery.

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.

Planning that includes how the ELA Modules will be taught during ELA core in DHH classrooms and scaffold during VE Resource push in.

Person Responsible: Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

Monitor the use of appropriate instructional practices and scaffolding to ensure each student's needs are met which includes high leverage practices in ELA, Math and Science

Person Responsible: Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

By When: October 2023

#4. 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.

Our current data shows that our proficiency rates in ELA, Math and Science are below 50%. However, it also tells us that in ELA 33% (4th) and 37% (5th) of our students in ELA are ready for grade level and above task, and 43% (4th), 53%(5th) in math are ready for grade level and above task. This signifies a need for differentiation to make sure our proficient students are pushed and challenged.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Cross Bayou plans to increase proficiency in ELA and Math by at least 12% in ELA, Math, and Science.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored by planning that focus on: What do we want students to learn? How will we know when they have learned it? How will we respond when they do not learn it? How will we respond when they already know it?

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@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.)

Identifying critical content (Marzano & Toth)

Teacher clarity (Hattie, Fisher, Frye)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Direct and explicit instruction includes modeling of the skills along with guided practice until mastery is achieved; direct explanations and clearly explained skills comprises explicit instruction; teachers are clear, unambiguous, direct and visible—until students meet mastery. Systematic instruction includes breaking lessons into sequential and manageable steps that go from simple to complex 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.

Utilize multiple forms of formative assessment and use the District Data PLC Protocol to game plan to utilize differentiated resources to inform future instruction in all content areas.

Person Responsible: Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

By When: October 2023

During collaborative planning that occurs within school hours or after-school planning sessions, engage in standards articulation to gain a deeper understanding of prior knowledge and future learning to support students' holistic understanding of the Big Ideas in ELA, Math and Science.

Person Responsible: Rachel McClure (mcclurer@pcsb.org)

By When: January 2024

Strengthen student inquiry skills through the implementation and monitoring of routine use of higher-level thinking through questioning, class discussions, problem solving activities, and/or collaborative study groups.

Person Responsible: Antonette Wilson (wilsonanto@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

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

Person Responsible: Rachel McClure (mcclurer@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group 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.

Our current data shows that our proficiency rates in ELA, Math and Science are below 50%. This signifies a need for small group instruction to address gaps and deficiencies in ELA and Math. As well as enriching and accelerating.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By addressing specific skills in ELA and Math during intervention. We will increase our student's proficiency by 12% ELA, Math, Science.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor the area of focus through data that guides teachers to group teachers by ability, strategy, expert/interest groups, cooperative tasks, and student choice.

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.)

The interventions that will be used will be decided by "what" the student needs and the research-based resources available.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy will be used to build strong foundational skills, math fluency (focus on number sense and operations) and in science engage in science inquiry.

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.

Develop effective small group instruction that might include:

Quickly assess who is struggling. This can be as simple as an exit ticket or as formal as a pre-assessment. ... as well those who already "have it"

Process and time framing for pulling students into the group.

Timing to make it quick, effective, and efficient.

Scaffolding the skills.

Documenting the intervention/enrichment

Person Responsible: Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

Define strategies for how to manage small groups in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

By When: September 2023

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).

Our Leadership Team, along with our team leaders have analyzed the state data to determine the best way to allocate school improvement funding and Title I Funds in an effort to build and improve capacity and close learning gaps. We will continue to monitor progress towards these goals in weekly grade level PLCs monthly school-based leadership team meetings to monitor students that are not proficient yet or making the appropriate gains towards proficiency and weekly MTSS meetings.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

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

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

Currently 51% of our 3rd grades are proficient in Math and 38% are proficient in ELA as measured by 2nd Grade STAR Data.

PM3 Data Showed 33% of our 4th grades are proficient in ELA, and 43% in math 37% of our 5th grades are proficient in ELA and 53% in math.

Strategically focus on 3-5 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Each scholar in grades K-2 will be administered the Early Literacy Formative Assessment Check (ELFAC) . Interventive plans and progress monitoring will be put into place for identified student. The expectation is that over 50% of student in grades K-2 will be proficient in ELA as a result of core instruction and interventions.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In 3rd grade data from Early Literacy Formative Assessment Check (ELFAC) coupled with the core phonics survey will be used to make intervention decisions. Through interventions and strong core instruction, assessment, and monitoring over 50% of 3rd - 5th scholars will be proficient by 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.

Our Area of Focus will be through learning communities that integrate the six components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language, comprehension, and vocabulary) into an explicit, systematic, and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies outlined in the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative.

Classroom walkthroughs and formative assessment data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Wilson, Antonette, wilsonanto@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

The Evidence Based Strategies will include:

Print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction.

Teaching students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words

Reinforcing the effectiveness of instruction in alphabets, fluency, and vocabulary

Providing instruction in broad oral language skills

Teaching students how to use reading comprehension strategies

Ensuring that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension

Rationale:

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

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

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Literacy Leadership School Literacy Leadership Teams are meeting regularly to look at data to make informed decisions about what professional learning and supports need to be in place to maximize student growth in reading.</p>	McClure, Rachel, mcclurer@pcsb.org
<p>Literacy Coaching Literacy coaches work with school principals to plan and implement consistent professional learning outlined by the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative around evidence-based practices grounded in the science of reading as well as the UFLC Flamingo Small group model to demonstrate a significant effect on improving student outcomes.</p>	Wilson, Antonette, wilsonanto@pcsb.org
<p>Literacy coaches prioritize time to those teachers, activities, and roles that will have the greatest impact on student achievement in reading, namely coaching, modeling, and mentoring in classrooms daily.</p>	Wilson, Antonette, wilsonanto@pcsb.org
<p>Develop a structure for ongoing formative assessment is in place to determine where instruction should be modified to meet individual student needs</p>	Wilson, Antonette, wilsonanto@pcsb.org
<p>Learning Communities (LCs) are guided by assessment data and are ongoing, engaging, interactive, collaborative, and job-embedded and provide time for teachers to collaborate, research, conduct lesson studies, and plan instruction.</p>	McClure, Rachel, mcclurer@pcsb.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

Information will be shared during the Annual Title 1 Meeting on before September 30, 2023. Information will be available year-round on our school website. During Conference Nights and Curriculum Nights information regarding Title 1 will be disseminated as well. <https://www.pcsb.org/crossbayou-es>

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))

Relationships will be developed through the activities included in the Parent Engagement Plan.
<https://www.pcsb.org/crossbayou-es>

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

Our plan to strengthen our student academic proficiency will be through our MTSS ISD instructional staff member being the teacher on record for one class ELA Block, Title 1 teachers will providing additional instructional support in ELA, Math and Science. Collaborative Planning hours will allow teachers to collaborate on student task and experiences in the classroom.

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))

Not applicable

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N?A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0811 - Cross Bayou Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional staff and administration attend in and out of county conferences to support this goal.</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$450.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0811 - Cross Bayou Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$450.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase schoolwide Positive Behavior Reward System</i>			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0811 - Cross Bayou Elementary School			\$300.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase instructional materials to support remediation and enrichment.</i>			
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				\$300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0811 - Cross Bayou Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$300.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase supplemental material in ELA, Math and Science.</i>			
Total:						\$1,550.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes