Fuguitt Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Fuguitt Elementary School

13010 101ST ST, Largo, FL 33773

http://www.fuguitt-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 yeears.

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.

The mission of Fuguitt Elementary is to prepare tomorrow's leaders today by engaging and inspiring students daily for success by connecting learning to real life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Fuguitt Elementary is 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
Bentley, Kathlene	Principal	The roles and responsibilities for the team members include providing leadership for a common vision, ensuring implementation of MTSS delivering Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction based on the student need, providing necessary professional development as it relates to the MTSS process, facilitating discussions as our SIP plan is planned, written and implemented by all staff. Our team meets weekly to address, monitor and problem solve the current status of Tiered interventions and SIP goals. Parents are included in the problem-solving system and regularly updated on current status and ongoing progress of SIP goals.
Lentz, Eliza	Assistant Principal	
Warner, Angie	School Counselor	
Harkins, Nancy	Psychologist	
Byrd, Tania	Teacher, ESE	
Hagan, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	
DeMeza, Niki	Attendance/ Social Work	

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.

All Fuguitt stakeholders are involved in the development of the SIP plan which include SIP committee content area members from each grade level/department. Input and feedback was provided for the creation of the SIP plan from all school staff, team leaders, SAC committee and school-based leadership team.

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation with the use of purposeful planning and data chat protocols. Focused data chats with SBLT, grade level/specialist teams and content area committees will take place monthly. These data chats will include data diving from school-wide, grade level to individual students. Significant priority will be monitoring those students with an achievement gap and those who struggle to show learning gains throughout the year. During these data chats, action planning will occur for instructional implementation to address the needs of the students in order for the students to make progress and close the achievement gap. The plan will be revised as necessary through SBLT/SIP committee meetings with feedback from all staff members.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A

	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	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	20	24	16	24	18	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	5	2	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	20	13	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	23	14	0	0	0	40
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	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	16	12	0	0	0	33

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	26	22	32	21	29	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	5	8	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	7	16	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	1	5	3	8	7	0	0	0	26

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	0	5	3	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	26	22	32	21	29	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	5	8	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	7	16	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	1	5	3	8	7	0	0	0	26

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	0	5	3	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
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*	58	55	56	48	54	57
ELA Learning Gains	71	62	61	75	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68	55	52	76	54	53
Math Achievement*	57	62	60	49	61	63
Math Learning Gains	73	65	64	70	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69	54	55	54	48	51
Science Achievement*	55	57	51	53	53	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	64			71		

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	515
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	42			
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	54			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	60			

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	58	71	68	57	73	69	55					64

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
SWD	30	44	36	29	55	53	44					
ELL	47	90		40	80							64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	66	64	34	65	62	38					
HSP	44	71		41	59		55					
MUL	83			75								
PAC												
WHT	65	69	57	68	77	75	61					
FRL	54	65	68	51	71	66	46					60

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	51	49	69	49	56	56	40					
SWD	34	42		36	46		41					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	40		28	53		23					
HSP	45	67		59	73		50					
MUL	44			63								
PAC												
WHT	59	45		51	52		48					
FRL	46	51	67	42	59	60	42					

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	48	75	76	49	70	54	53					71
SWD	27	67	74	30	64	52	30					
ELL	33	62		33	77							71
AMI												

						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
ASN												
BLK	35	70		43	62		29					
HSP	45	86		45	73							
MUL	33			42								
PAC												
WHT	52	74	79	51	70	62	60					
FRL	42	72	73	41	65	54	40					64

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	71%	57%	14%	54%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	58%	8%	58%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	53%	-15%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	62%	-11%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	66%	0%	61%	5%
05	2023 - Spring	65%	61%	4%	55%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	60%	10%	51%	19%

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.

3rd grade ELA data was the lowest performing. Contributing factors to this performance was due to the transition of implementation of content aligned to the new BEST standards, teacher ongoing professional development in learning BEST Standards and students acclimating to computer-based testing. As significant factor to these performance scores was the scheduling of the ELA block at the end of the day.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year is the ELA proficiency scores in 3rd. Factors that contributed to this decline was scheduling of the master schedule, attendance, implementation of the new BEST standards, computer-based testing and effective use of instructional resources.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 3rd Grade ELA. Fuguitt's 3rd grade ELA proficiency score was 42% which is 11% below the district's 53%. Factors that contributed to this decline was scheduling of the ELA block in the master schedule, implementation of the new BEST standards, computer-based testing, attendance and effective use of instructional resources.

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

Overall proficiency levels in 5th grade Math and ELA showed significant improvement. New actions taken in this area was change in grade level teachers as well as purposeful looping of student teacher assignments.

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

1. Number of level 1 students in ELA & Math
2. Attendance

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

1. Increase student achievement in 3rd grade ELA and Math
2. Increase student attendance and lower absent rate of students
3. Increase student achievement to match or exceed the district's achievement scores in each grade level subject area

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to standards- aligned instruction will focus on supporting teachers with research-based practices that align with B.E.S.T. standards within the specific content area and the NGSSS for Science.

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

By progress monitoring 3 at least 75% of students will demonstrate proficiency on the FAST PM assessment.

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

Monitored through student, teacher, grade and school wide data: classwork, formal and informal formative assessments, district unit/benchmark assessments and walkthrough observation data focused on standards-based and target/task alignment. Review and discuss data using protocols during data chats, PLC's and SBLT. Administration will monitor coaching plans for teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathlene Bentley (bentleyk@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), Feedback (Hattie, 0.70 effect size); the importance of assessment and feedback for teachers (Hattie & Zierer, 2017), Planning and Prediction (Hattie, 0.76 effect size)

Implement tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving.

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

As teachers become more skilled in this strategy, they will see remarkable changes in students' abilities to process and understand new content because they are able to identify which content is critical and understand how learned content scaffolds in complexity. A classroom of students identifies critical content within standards, but also studies, recognizes, and celebrates as knowledge grows increasingly more sophisticated.

By shifting from Routine tasks to Reasoning tasks, students are engaged in high-cognitive-demand tasks with multiple solution pathways. Effective teaching of mathematics engages students in solving and discussing tasks that promote mathematical reasoning and problem solving and allow multiple entry points and varied solution strategies. Effective Mathematics Teaching Practices (Principles to Actions, NCTM 2014)

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.

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

Person Responsible: Eliza Lentz (lentze@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Purposefully combine/stack standards and benchmarks to support learning so that a benchmark is spotlighted and supporting benchmarks (such as ELA Expectations) that enhance instruction are incorporated in the lesson to meet the demands of the spotlighted benchmark.

Person Responsible: Eliza Lentz (lentze@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Provide regular structures for planning/PLCs where teachers regularly engage in data/student work analysis as well as intellectual prep and lesson rehearsal including planning for scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible: Kathlene Bentley (bentleyk@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

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

Person Responsible: Kathlene Bentley (bentleyk@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

During collaborative planning, engage in standards articulation to gain a deeper understanding of prior knowledge and future learning to support students' holistic understanding of the content.

Person Responsible: Kathlene Bentley (bentleyk@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

Utilizing our EWI, attendance dashboard and CST data, we currently have 102 students with an absent rate of 10%+.

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

We expect 90% of our student enrollment to have an attendance absent rate that is less at 10% by May 2024.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through bi-monthly Child Study Team meetings, SBLT and PBIS grade level PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Niki DeMeza (demezan@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.)

Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all Tiers on an ongoing basis and implement a schoolwide reward-based system for attendance. Use the Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) and Restorative Practices framework to increase the involvement of our families in supporting their child's learning, including attendance and behavior.

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

This strategy was selected because if focuses on building relationships and understanding with students and families. As a result of strong partnerships with school and family, it is likely to reveal the root causes of the students' absences. We believe the problem continues because families lack the understanding of the importance of attending school every day. We will use intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for student, class and grade-levelrecognition and celebrations.

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.

Review attendance taking process with all staff to ensure attendance is accurately recorded and updated in a timely manner.

Person Responsible: Kathlene Bentley (bentleyk@pcsb.org)

By When: October 2023

Implement school-wide attendance incentives that help students meet short- and long-term goals.

Person Responsible: Niki DeMeza (demezan@pcsb.org)

By When: November 2023

Engage students and families in attendance related activities to ensure and educate our families on the importance of daily attendance.

Person Responsible: Niki DeMeza (demezan@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Implement Tier 2 and 3 plans for student specific needs to review barriers and effectiveness on a bi-

Person Responsible: Niki DeMeza (demezan@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

School Social Worker reach out to the families of students returning in grades 3-5 with attendance below 90% to share attendance and academic data and provide any needed family services.

Person Responsible: Niki DeMeza (demezan@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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.

Eliminate the gap between the proficiency rates in ELA and mathematics for black and non-black students. The gap is occurring due to lack of purposeful differentiation of grade level content and inefficient high yield engagement strategies by teachers. The instructional practice focus for teachers will understanding and usage of research-based practices.

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

Current data indicates the gap between our black students and our non-black students was 40% in ELA and 41% in Math. Our goal is to decrease the gap by at least 5% in ELA and Math as measured by the FAST
assessment.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through data, classroom walk-throughs, formal and informal observations, formative assessments, district and state assessments and through collaborative PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathlene Bentley (bentleyk@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.)

Implement the 6 M's of culturally relevant teaching. (Meaning, Models, Monitoring,
Mouth, Movement, and Music). Ensure black students are participating in extended
learning opportunities before and after school. Ensure SEL, PBIS and Restorative Practices
are in place to support students.

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

If the implementation of the 6M's, SEL, PBIS and Restorative practices are being used with
fidelity engagement levels and needs for all students will be met. As a result the gap between black and non-black students would be minimized or
eliminated.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Provide ongoing PD to teachers and staff in 6M's, SEL, PBIS and Restorative Practices

Person Responsible: Angie Warner (warnerm@pcsb.org)

By When: December 2023

Monitor assessment data and action plan for areas needed focusing on subgroup of black and non black students monthly.

Person Responsible: Kathy Hagan (hagank@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Ensure black students are enrolled and attending PromiseTime.

Person Responsible: Eliza Lentz (lentze@pcsb.org)

By When: October 2023

Ensure use of evidence-based strategies are being implemented in classroom instructional practices through discussions in PLC, classroom observations and monitoring of lesson plans.

Person Responsible: Eliza Lentz (lentze@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#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.

Ensure small group instruction and 1:1 specially designed instruction is designed and implemented in alignment with evidence-based practices.

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 proficiency of our SWD to 75% in ELA and Math.

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

Use of formative and informal assessments, progress monitoring data, observations, PLCs and data chats with collaboration among grade level and VE/ESE teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathlene Bentley (bentleyk@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.)

Explicit and direct instruction; multi-sensory approach to all learning; utilize a systematic approach for the delivery of instruction

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

Multi-sensory instruction uses visual, auditory, kinesthetic-tactile modalities in acquisition of reading skills. 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.

Provide Professional Development on Specially Designed Instruction

Person Responsible: Eliza Lentz (lentze@pcsb.org)

By When: December 2023

Train teachers on the use of assistive technology

Person Responsible: Eliza Lentz (lentze@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Monitor the use of appropriate practices and scaffolding to ensure students' needs are met

Person Responsible: Kathlene Bentley (bentleyk@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Teachers will participate in professional development associated with utilizing a multi-sensory, direct, explicit way of teaching

Person Responsible: Kathlene Bentley (bentleyk@pcsb.org)

By When: February 2024

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

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

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.

Stakeholders will be able to access Fuguitt's SIP through many venues: school website (https://www.pcsb.org/fuguitt-es), accessible in the front office in Title I resource corner, link shared through school newsletters, and accessible during family involvement events on campus. It will also be shared at our annual Title I meeting, PTA and SAC meetings. Administrator will review the SIP as well as review progress toward goals at the beginning of the year, mid-year and end of year.

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))

Effective communication is essential to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders. This year we will focus on strengthening our communication initiatives. Our

Title I annual parent meeting is planned to provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to receive the information at their convenience. We will share the parent compact with our school community to clearly share our goals and expectations as partners in education. In addition to real-time updates on our website and classdojo, school updates will occur quarterly that showcase student work and experiences that are happening on campus. We will continue to host family involvement events as well as seek input and feedback from parents, students and community members in order to foster a positive school community for all.

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))

Focus this year will be acquiring deeper knowledge of the BEST Standards and working to identify the progression of standards through vertical articulation of grade levels. Effective collaboration among grade level teams/specialists will provide assist in the transition of new content for students by building on prior knowledge. In addition, student experiences will be priority when planning instructional content. Purposeful planning of content with student interest in mind and providing students the opportunity to have new experiences connecting to academics will increase engagement and quality of learning.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A