

Pinellas County Schools

Mildred Helms Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Mildred Helms Elementary School

561 CLEARWATER LARGO RD S, Largo, FL 33770

<http://www.mildred-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.

Mildred Helms Elementary International Baccalaureate (IB) World School is committed to developing knowledgeable, inquiring, caring and internationally minded lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success - Each learner will achieve a year's worth of growth in a year.

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
Brennan, Shannon	Principal	Principal, Instructional Leader, IB Head of School
Cooper, Karris	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Instructional Leader, PBIS Coach
Ovalle, Michelle	Other	Leads MTSS, supports SBLT, CST, Lead Mentor
Gomez-Nieto, Gabriel	Teacher, K-12	ELL Lead Teacher
Riser, Mary	Teacher, K-12	1st grade Lead Teacher
Lannon, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade Lead Teacher
Yuncker, Jerrie	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade Lead Teacher
Enlow, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	4th grade Lead Teacher
Ingram, Jennifer	School Counselor	School Counselor
Hubbard, Emily	Psychologist	School Psychologist
Kelly, Jennifer	Magnet Coordinator	IB PYP Magnet Coordinator
Hauburger, Cheryl	Parent Engagement Liaison	Family and Community Liaison
Callahan, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Lead Teacher
Phoenix, Lori	Teacher, ESE	ESE Lead Teacher
Harmon, Mandy	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Lead Teacher

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The school leadership team provides opportunities for input from all stakeholders. Staff members meet and discuss schoolwide goals, instructional models for improvement and action steps to support student achievement. Information including schoolwide data is shared with parents and community members at

SAC meetings and family events such as Open House to elicit input on the plan. Survey and corresponding data are also used in plan development.

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 will be monitored for effectiveness and impact on students through consistent review after assessment cycle data and progress monitoring reviews. If needed, the plan will be revised to support the continuous improvement of all students in all subgroups.

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	51%
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B 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	0	29	26	19	8	15	0	0	0	97	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
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	3	5	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	18	16	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	19	12	0	0	0	34	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	6	7	4	3	0	0	0	28	

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	1	2	4	9	8	0	0	0	24

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	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

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	2	29	27	22	21	15	0	0	0	116	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	10	1	5	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	29	9	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	20	9	0	0	0	33	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	3	2	6	4	8	0	0	0	27	

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	10	10	0	0	0	0	21

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	2	29	27	22	21	15	0	0	0	116	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	10	1	5	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	29	9	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	20	9	0	0	0	33	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	3	2	6	4	8	0	0	0	27	

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	10	10	0	0	0	0	21

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	15
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*	49	55	56	44	54	57
ELA Learning Gains	62	62	61	43	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62	55	52	32	54	53
Math Achievement*	60	62	60	54	61	63
Math Learning Gains	56	65	64	49	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46	54	55	38	48	51
Science Achievement*	52	57	51	46	53	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	62			64		

* 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	449
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	3	2
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	55			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	51			

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	49	62	62	60	56	46	52					62
SWD	6	43	46	29	45		10					
ELL	29	71		40	62							62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	53	40	44	63	55	29					
HSP	40	53		60	55		58					61
MUL	35	64		59	40							
PAC												
WHT	59	66	73	67	53	43	63					
FRL	37	57	62	49	52	48	42					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	49	43	50	55	41	26	41					54
SWD	21	40	50	33	27		13					
ELL	29	40		38	27		24					54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	35		39	35		19					
HSP	43	26		50	26		29					46
MUL	41			48								
PAC												
WHT	62	61		65	52		52					
FRL	42	42	43	47	39	31	26					48

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	44	43	32	54	49	38	46					64
SWD	12	32	31	29	45	36	13					50
ELL	32	30	30	46	50		29					64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	44		39	38	45						
HSP	41	37	45	43	34	30	39					65
MUL	43			71								
PAC												
WHT	52	44	19	64	63	42	52					
FRL	37	39	37	45	47	45	37					61

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	46%	57%	-11%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	58%	-5%	58%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	53%	-4%	50%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	54%	62%	-8%	59%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	66%	5%	61%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	61%	-8%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	55%	60%	-5%	51%	4%

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.

Lowest student achievement scores were in ELA. The contributing factors were gaps in foundational skill sets in primary students and comprehension skills in intermediate students.

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

Overall achievement data in ELA, Math and Science on state testing increased from the previous 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.

ELA had the greatest gap in relationship to state average. Factors that contributed to the gap were student understanding of academic vocabulary and deficits in reading skills and strategies.

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

Science data showed the most improvement over the last year. The increase can be attributed to a stronger focus on academic vocabulary and implementation of additional hands-on experiences. In addition, the initiation of an intervention with targeted students within a science gaming club provided as an enrichment opportunity.

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

A potential area of concern is student attendance with the number of students from last year in primary grades with absences greater than 10%.

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

Increase student proficiency in ELA, Math and Science. Targeted focus on ELA achievement of 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 ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

The goal is to ensure whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block of both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase overall student proficiency in grades 3-5 to 59% scoring level 3 or above on state assessments, PM3. Increase grade 3 proficiency to 70% as measured by the PM3 FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Monitored through walkthroughs, observations and evidence of collaborative and strategic lesson planning using the B.E.S.T. standards...

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Brennan (brennans@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 systematic instruction

Scaffolded instruction

Corrective feedback

Differentiated instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Explicit instructional practice for novices in learning new content, skill, or concept: 1) full, clear explanations, 2) teacher modeling, 3) Provide a "worked-out" sample with full teacher explanation, 3) Full guidance during student practice, 4) Teacher corrective feedback.

Teachers can differentiate at least four classroom elements based on student readiness, interest, or learning profile: (1) content—what the student needs to learn or how the student will get access to the information; (2) process—activities in which the student engages in order to make sense of or master the content; (3) products—culminating projects that ask the student to rehearse, apply, and extend what he or she has learned in a unit; and (4) learning environment—the way the classroom works and feels.

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.

- Deliver explicit, step-by-step instruction—in multiple, briskly paced cycles. related to student interests & cultural backgrounds; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.
- Provide support and feedback focused on explicit, systematic and sequential approaches to reading and writing instruction including a gradual release of responsibility model of instruction.
- Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/ more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.
- 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: Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the 2023-24 school year.

#2. 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 for Students with Disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The ELA proficiency of Students with Disabilities will increase to 41% or higher.

Monitoring:

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

Monitored through walkthroughs, observations and evidence of collaborative and strategic lesson planning using the B.E.S.T. standards and student progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Brennan (brennans@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

Provide teachers with updated high leverage practices

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

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

Person Responsible: Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the 2023-24 school year.

#3. 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.

Increase positive culture and climate utilizing a systematic approach to positive reinforcement and recognition of student behavior and attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase in student attendance by 5% and decrease in student referrals/infraction by 10% as compared to the 2022-23 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance data will be monitored through the Child Study Team on a biweekly basis. Referral, infraction and call log data will be utilized to monitor student behaviors and responses. Schoolwide positive behavior program will track recognition of positive student behavior. Frequent walkthroughs and observations to ensure fidelity of implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karris Cooper (cooperkar@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.)

PBIS schoolwide program implementation utilizing Guidelines for Success and researched based interventions, including Restorative Practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS is a researched based program that encompasses a positive reinforcement system and appropriate classroom and school-based responses to student behavior.

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 to all staff members to refresh and reteach PBIS strategies, schoolwide Guidelines for Success and expectations.

Person Responsible: Karris Cooper (cooperkar@pcsb.org)

By When: Professional development will occur in preschool with refreshers throughout the school year as needed.

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

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

Increase proficiency in Science to exceed district and state average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Science proficiency will increase by 7% in grade 5 as measured by the state science assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Monitored through walkthroughs, observations and evidence of collaborative and strategic lesson planning using the Florida State Academic Standards for Science and student progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karris Cooper (cooperkar@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.)

Deepen the understanding of the Florida's State Academic Standards for Science (FSASS – previously named NGSSS) as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- When focusing on Teacher Clarity, it is important for teachers to have clear intentions and success criteria in mind when presenting science content. Teachers also need to be able to provide effective feedback on and for learning. To do this, there needs to be a clear understanding of the learning goals that are aligned to the standards. Understanding the depth and breadth of the standards will support this work.
- Prior Ability: Activating and integrating prior knowledge is one of the most powerful teaching strategies. It is important to slow down, ask our students what they already know about the matter, and make important connections to what is to come. Understanding the scope and sequence of the science standards will provide teachers a larger picture of learning - past, present, and future.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

- During collaborative planning that occurs within school hours or after-school planning sessions, synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and content limits to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.
- 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 science.

- Teachers and administrators engage in the just-in-time training they need to support implementation of the curriculum and other instructional initiatives already underway.
- Ensure professional development is content-focused, teacher and student-focused, instructionally relevant, and actionable.

Person Responsible: Karris Cooper (cooperkar@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the 2023-24 school year.

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

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

Increase Math proficiency in grades 3-5 to meet or exceed district and state averages.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase Math proficiency in grades 3-5 to by 7% as measured by state progress monitoring assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Monitored through walkthroughs, observations and evidence of collaborative and strategic lesson planning using the B.E.S.T. standards and student progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Brennan (brennans@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
Pose purposeful questions
Build procedural fluency from conceptual understanding
Support productive struggle in learning mathematics
Elicit and use evidence of student thinking

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Use and connect mathematical representations. Effective teaching of mathematics engages students in making connections among mathematical representations to deepen understanding of mathematics concepts and procedures and as tools for problem solving.
Facilitate meaningful mathematical discourse. Effective teaching of mathematics facilitates discourse among students to build shared understanding of mathematical ideas by analyzing and comparing student approaches and arguments.
Pose purposeful questions. Effective teaching of mathematics uses purposeful questions to assess and advance students' reasoning and sense making about important mathematical ideas and relationships.
Build procedural fluency from conceptual understanding. Effective teaching of mathematics builds fluency with procedures on a foundation of conceptual understanding so that students, over time, become skillful in using procedures flexibly as they solve contextual and mathematical problems.
Support productive struggle in learning mathematics.
Elicit and use evidence of student thinking.

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.

- Employ instructional practices and routines that promote student-centered learning (Higher-Order Questioning, Pinellas Problem Solving Routine, Play-Explore-Investigate (PEI) Routine, Number Sense Making Routines, Collaborative structures, High-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback).
- Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and intervention, based on data, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced tasks for students above benchmark.
- Utilize multiple forms of formative assessment and use the District Data PLC Protocol to game plan to utilize differentiated resources to inform future instruction.

Person Responsible: Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the 2023-24 school year.

#6. 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.

Close the achievement gap between African American students and other sub groups.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase achievement of African American student in ELA by 10% as measured by state progress monitoring assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Observations, walkthroughs, specific feedback in regard to teaching strategies in relationship to student performance. Student progress monitoring data will be analyzed by subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Brennan (brennans@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 systematic instruction that includes differentiation, scaffolding and support through high leverage practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers are more effective when providing explicit guidance with practice and feedback rather than requiring student discovery while learning new skills/concepts. A review of 70 studies indicates that failure to provide strong instructional support produced measurable loss of learning; minimal guidance can increase the achievement gap.

Differentiation consists of the efforts of teachers to respond to variance among learners in the classroom through content, process, products and learning environments.

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 the 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 the entire staff.

Engage in professional development associated with utilizing a multi-sensory, direct, explicit way of teaching including music, movement, and multiple methods of responding.

Increase gifted identification in primary grades to expand the number of African American/Black students in the Gifted and Talented Program.

Person Responsible: Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the 2023-24 school year.

Utilize the 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 the entire staff.

Engage in professional development associated with utilizing a multi-sensory, direct, explicit way of teaching including music, movement, and multiple methods of responding.

Increase gifted identification in primary grades to expand the number of African American/Black students in the Gifted and Talented Program.

Person Responsible: Shannon Brennan (brennans@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the 2023-24 school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

School Improvement allocations will be shared with staff members. Leadership team members will elicit input from grade level or specialist teams for resources needed to address areas of achievement gaps. School-based leadership team will utilize data and input from teams to construct allocations for interventions and activities that align to meet the needs of our students in the targeted areas of focus.

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

N/A

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

Strategically focus on grades 3-5 teachers and instruction 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

n/a

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3 and 5 will increase proficiency to 60% on statewide standardized ELA assessment.

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.

Monitored through classrooms observations and walkthrough with feedback. Analysis of student progress monitoring data and collaboration in the development of grade level, class and student action plans.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brennan, Shannon, brennans@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?

Grade 3 & 5 - Provide explicit, systematic and scaffolded instruction, ensure students read connected text daily to support reading accuracy, fluency and comprehension. Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies. Reinforce effectiveness of instruction in fluency and vocabulary.

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?

In developing literacy, students need instruction in vocabulary and reading comprehension skills. Employing the evidence-based strategies and action steps will enable students to 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 Coaching</p> <p>? Literacy coaches work with school principals to plan and implement consistent professional learning using strategies that demonstrate a significant effect on improving student outcomes.</p> <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> <p>? Literacy coaches support and train teachers to administer assessments, analyze data and use data to differentiate instruction.</p>	Cooper, Karris, cooperkar@pcsb.org
<p>Assessment</p> <p>? Develop a structure for ongoing formative assessment is in place to determine where instruction should be modified to meet individual student needs</p> <p>? Determine a structure for conducting screening, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessments is in place to identify students with a substantial deficiency in reading.</p>	Brennan, Shannon, brennans@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.

The School Improvement Plan will be shared with all stakeholders by administration and instructional staff at the Title I Annual Meeting and schoolwide Open House. Key components of the SIP as well as how parents can access the full version via the state, district websites and school website at <https://www.pcsb.org/domain/6659> will be made available. The SIP will also be shared within school newsletters and at SAC meetings held through the 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))

Building positive relationships with parents, families and community stakeholders is critical to the success of our school's vision and mission. Family involvement events such as Literacy, Math and Science nights as well as Student Led Conferences and Parent Teacher conferences are important components to keeping parents informed of student progress and providing resources for at home support. Progress is also reported through midterms, report cards and the availability of parents to see student academic grades and scores in FOCUS. The Parent and Family Engagement Plan is available on the school website at <https://www.pcsb.org/domain/1960>.

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)

Strengthening the academic program will result in a greater focus on student engagement within an inquiry-based approach to conceptual learning. The Extended Learning Program will be utilized to provide additional support through interventions in ELA and math as well as opportunities for enrichment within clubs and academic groups.

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))

The plan is developed in coordination with federal, state and local services such as More Health, local violence prevention programs and with the support of district approved educational partners.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes