Leila Davis Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Leila Davis Elementary School

2630 LANDMARK DR, Clearwater, FL 33761

http://www.davis-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.

Encouraging life-long learners in an equitable and engaging environment with respect, kindness, and acceptance for ALL.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Success for ALL Students

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
Durst, William	Principal	
Gualtieri, Kathryn Gualtieri	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our process each year in developing our school improvement plan includes the formation of a voluntary team of teachers and staff members to come up with our large areas of focus based on our current student performance data. Multiple meetings are conducted to narrow our focus and set goals for future performance. Input from students and parents is used throughout the plan and our School Advisory Council is the final group to provide feedback and approval of the plan.

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))

All data sources are monitored to ensure the school is on track to meet our goals. After each progress monitoring window of the F.A.S.T. is complete, thorough data review and reflections will be conducted by all teachers during PLC's. With areas of improvement identified, action steps created by teachers will be implemented.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	34%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	0	29	19	18	12	12	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	21	16	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	14	16	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	7	9	4	3	0	0	0	31

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	6	4	0	0	0	11

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	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	0	25	25	14	16	14	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	7	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	9	0	0	0	25
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	1	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	25	25	14	16	14	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	7	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	9	0	0	0	25
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	1	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	12
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*	67	55	56	69	54	57
ELA Learning Gains	66	62	61	67	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48	55	52	58	54	53
Math Achievement*	70	62	60	74	61	63
Math Learning Gains	64	65	64	69	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43	54	55	60	48	51

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	59	57	51	64	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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
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	30	Yes	1	1
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	87			

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%
BLK	48			
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	52			

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	67	66	48	70	64	43	59					58
SWD	35	46	31	35	22	17	25					
ELL	46	75		54	50							58
AMI												
ASN	82			91								
BLK	43	50		48	53		45					
HSP	63	58		59	55	45	57					80
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	70	69	45	73	67	41	61					
FRL	54	64	45	57	58	45	41					50

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	69	59	35	67	58	45	77					65
SWD	46	50		44								
ELL	59			35								65

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33			32								
HSP	70	71		63	54		83					69
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	72	60	36	72	62	43	82					
FRL	54	48	27	52	37	33	63					79

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	69	67	58	74	69	60	64					78
SWD	52	61	69	45	61	63	43					
ELL	56	65		56	70		55					78
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	46		50	77		45					
HSP	59	78	58	65	70	60	74					73
MUL	55			64								
PAC												
WHT	73	68	67	77	69	62	66					80
FRL	52	57	53	58	58	50	45					71

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	65%	57%	8%	54%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	58%	12%	58%	12%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	53%	12%	50%	15%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2023 - Spring	81%	62%	19%	59%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	66%	8%	61%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	61%	2%	55%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2023 - Spring	59%	60%	-1%	51%	8%

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.

Comparing results from 2022 to 2023 in grades 3-5 ELA proficiency increased from 67% to 69%, Mathematics proficiency increased from 70% to 76%, and our Science proficiency in 5th grade increased from 59% to 60%.

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

There were not any components that showed decline from the prior year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our science performance is above the state average by 9% and matches our district average of 60%. However, science is lagging behind our ELA and mathematics performance. Historically our school performs at 10-15% average.

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

Our school improved 7% in mathematics proficiency on F.A.S.T.
1. Focus on targeted Dreambox usage
2. School wide recognition/celebration of Dreambox lesson completion.
3. Extended Learning Programs (before and after school)
4. District coaching support with planning and targeted spiral reviews.

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

1. Attendance of students missing more than 10% of the school year in grades K,1, and 2nd grades.
2. Number of students in grades 3-5 scoring a level one in reading as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.)

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

1. Science school wide
2. Reading and mathematics intervention
3. Positive culture and environment: Student Agency
4. Students with Disabilities

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 Intervention

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.

F.A.S.T. PM1,2, and 3 data, Renaissance Star Assessments, and progress-monitoring data collected from the 2022-23 school year showed students making learning gains and specifically in our lowest quartile (L25) are not making adequate progress towards proficiency due to a lack of fidelity of small-group instruction during intervention block and intentional planning of deficit skills that relate to grade level content.

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

- The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 69% to 80%.
- The percent of all students achieving Mathematics proficiency will increase from 77% to 85%
- 75% of our students in both ELA and Mathematics will make learning gains.

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

State of Florida Progress Monitoring assessment (FAST), ELA Module assessments, IStation, Dreambox, Mathematics unit assessments, Running Records, FLKRS, and ELFAC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)

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

Use and connect mathematical representations.
Facilitate meaningful discourse (ELA, mathematics)
Build procedural fluency from conceptual understanding (mathematics)
Differentiated instruction (ELA, mathematics)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To guarantee equitable supports are in place for all students to grow.

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.

-Focus on fidelity of small group instruction with intentional planning, Intervention block and progress monitoring.
-Flamingo Training for K-2 teachers and modeling of intervention strategies for foundational literacy skills by district coaches for grades 3-5 teachers
-Scheduling that ensures a common planning time with general education and ESE teachers to plan for

data analysis and a co-teaching model.
-ELFAC as an ongoing weekly progress monitoring tool to inform instruction.
- Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and intervention, based on formative assessment data, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced tasks for students above benchmark.
- Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark in the early grades, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to close gaps early.

Person Responsible: William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)

By When: Following each F.A.S.T. progress monitoring cycle.

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#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.

Build student agency where ownership of student growth is intrinsic both academically and socially.

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

Increase student understanding of their efficacy in the learning environment. Students creating their own roadmap to success. 80% of students will make learning gains in ELA and mathematics.

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

Progress monitoring cycles 1 and 2 of F.A.S.T.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathryn Gualtieri Gualtieri (gualtierik@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.)

Second Step program, student-led conferences, data walls and portfolios

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Take ownership of their learning and growth goals.

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.

- Development of student portfolio team.
- Fall and Winter Student-Led conferences with family members that are focused on goal-setting opportunities where students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals, monitoring their academic progress throughout the year, revising their goals based on data, and celebrating successes.
- Stakeholder outreach to strengthen the culture of high expectations for all students.
- Regularly schedule opportunities to collaborate and engage in meaningful discussions to support teachers and improve student behavior outcomes.
- Continuation of Second Step.org program for social-emotional learning.

Person Responsible: William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)
By When:

#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.

Discrepancies exist in our ELA, Mathematics, and Science proficiency scores. ELA and Mathematics are noticeably higher in performance compared to Science.

- The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 69% to 80%.
- The percent of all students achieving Mathematics proficiency will increase from 77% to 85%
- 75% of our students in both ELA and Mathematics will make learning gains.
- The percent of all students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 60% to 80%

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

The percent of all students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 60% to 80%

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

District unit assessments, science diagnostic assessment, mid-year assessment, and mock SSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathryn Gualtieri Gualtieri (gualtierik@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.)

- Cognitive Task Analysis
- Planning and Predicting:

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- Cognitive Task Analysis: Cognitive Task Analysis means to teach students not just the content, but how to think about the content. For example, if a student is struggling in science, rather than assigning more exercises the teacher might teach the student to "see" the information through a diagram, model, or investigation. This will provide the student with a thinking strategy that can be applied to future problems.
- Planning and Predicting: It is imperative that there is intention planning and the use of time; determining how students are going to perform and what they will need to perform well.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

- Data analysis after every ELA, math, and science assessment that includes goal setting with timelines of action steps in student portfolios.
- Intentional planning in each grade level of both the Science block and the Integration of Science

throughout the school day with district coach support to target specific needs.
- School-wide engagement of science vocabulary and concepts involving all staff members taking part in gaming.
- Teachers will utilize district curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.
- Regularly collaborate as a leadership team to engage in meaningful discussions and collective goal setting around improving student outcomes.
-Further our work with student-led conferences (2x per year) implement goal setting in all grades where students regularly maintaing their portfolios and participate in setting their own goals. Students will revise those goals based on PM cycle data and celebrating success.

Person Responsible: Kathryn Gualtieri Gualtieri (gualtierik@pcsb.org)

By When: Following each science unit and diagnostic reviews.

- Employ instructional practices that result in students doing the work of the lesson (higher-order questioning, quick demonstration followed by practice, limiting teacher talk, high-quality feedback, and opportunities to use that feedback).
- 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.
- Develop, implement, and monitor a school-wide plan and timeline to support students' natural wonderings through the use of science projects (experiments, research/models, field studies and engineer design tasks), cumulating in a school science night.
- Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to positive expectations for success; novel tasks or other approaches to stimulate curiosity; meaningful tasks related to student interests & cultural backgrounds; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.

Person Responsible: Kathryn Gualtieri Gualtieri (gualtierik@pcsb.org)

By When: Following each module, unit, topic assessment cycle.

-Utilize MTR Coaching tool to provide feedback to individual teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff.
-Utilize ELA walkthrough tool and other ELA tools to provide weekly feedback to individual ELA teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement with entire staff.

Person Responsible: William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)

By When:

#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.

F.A.S.T. PM1, 2, and 3 data, Renaissance Star Assessments, FSAA, and progress-monitoring data collected from the 2022-23 school year showed students making learning gains and specifically in our lowest quartile (L25) are not making adequate progress towards proficiency.

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

-The percent of all students showing learning gains in ELA will be 80% as measured by F.A.S.T.
-The percent of all students demonstrating learning gains Mathematics will be 80% as measured by F.A.S.T.
-Student proficiency on FSAA will be 80% in all content areas.

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

-Monitor growth on IEP goals.
-Classroom Walkthroughs
-State of Florida Progress Monitoring assessment (F.A.S.T.), ELA Module assessments, IStation, Dreambox, Science unit assessments, Mathematics unit assessments, Running Records, FLKRS, and ELFAC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Durst (durstw@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.)

1. Continually review performance data and classroom instruction through an equity lens to ensure our students with disabilities are receiving the necessary and equitable supports to succeed.
2. Intentionally plan with general education teachers.
3. Use of data chats to analyze student performance and progress towards IEP goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A need exists to intentionally frame conversations around SWD performance in all content areas. Intentional action plans that focus on IEP goals, specially designed instruction, and application to B.E.S.T. standards content with all stakeholder supports and communication will close the performance gap.

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.

1. Implement Teachtown Curriculum as part of core instruction for access point classrooms specifically for reading and math.
2. Secure district ESE coaching to ensure an understanding of the curriculum and support levels for monitoring of student progress to make informed decisions for the creation of specially designed instruction.
3. Scheduling that ensures a common planning time with general education and ESE teachers to plan for data analysis and a co-teaching model.
4. Collect and interpret data from multiple sources to track the use of accommodations while progress monitoring achievement utilizing instruments aligned to the targeted area that promotes services in the least restrictive environment whenever possible.

Person Responsible: William Durst (durstw@pcsb.org)

By When: Following each F.A.S.T. progress monitoring cycle.

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

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).

Based on ongoing progress monitoring of all content areas, funds will be allocated as necessary to provide targeted resources and coaching support.

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

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

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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

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.

Not applicable

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))

Not applicable

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))

Not applicable

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))

Not applicable

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))

Not applicable

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).

Not applicable

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))

Not applicable

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))

Not applicable

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: Intervention				$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0991 - Leila Davis Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$1,500.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24

			Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0991 - Leila Davis Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$1,000.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0991 - Leila Davis Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$1,000.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$0.00
					Total:	$3,500.00

Budget Approval

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

No