

Pinellas County Schools

Mount Vernon 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	28

Mount Vernon Elementary School

4629 13TH AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33713

<http://www.mtvernon-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.

The mission of Mt. Vernon Elementary is to promote highest student achievement through mutual respect, responsibility and partnerships within a safe learning environment in order to enable students to achieve their goals and become responsible, productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% student success

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dixon, Nikishia	Principal	Facilitates and monitors the execution and implementation process of School Improvement Plan.
Jones, Julie	Assistant Principal	Supports execution, monitoring, and implementation process of School Improvement Plan.
Toledo, Heather	Reading Coach	Works directly with the school-based leadership team(SBLT) and classroom teachers in assisting with the full implementation and monitoring of the district's adopted ELA program in response to intervention needed for student achievement.
Braungart, Katheirne	Science Coach	
Brown, Shinique	Psychologist	Works to support the success of students academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally. Collaborates with educators, parents, and other professionals to create safe, healthy, and supportive learning environment that strengthen connections between home, school, and the community for all students. Identifies and assesses the learning, development, and adjustment characteristics and needs of individuals and groups, as well as, the environmental factors that affect learning and adjustment. Provides interventions to students to support the teaching process and to maximize learning and adjustment. Assists in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs to meet identified learning and adjustment needs. Delivers a planned and coordinated program of psychological services.
Trotter, Angela	Attendance/ Social Work	Works to support the success of students academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally. Collaborates with educators, parents, and other professionals to create safe, healthy, and supportive learning environments that strengthen connections between home, school, and the community for all students. Identifies and assesses the learning, development, and adjustment characteristics and needs of individuals and groups, as well as, the environmental factors that affect learning and adjustment. Provides interventions to students to support the teaching process and to maximize learning and adjustment. Assists in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs to meet identified learning and adjustment needs. Delivers a planned and coordinated program of psychological services.

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.

SIP Committees are established and meet the 1st Tuesday of each month. Each SIP Committee oversees their particular SIP Goal/Action steps and submits to the staff for review/feedback. The leadership team meets to review input and develop the SIP. Plan is then shared with all stakeholders for additional feedback. This is working document and will be frequently revisited and updated to meet the needs of the school.

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 regularly by the SBLT/ILT which meets weekly to address building trends, instructional practices, and review quantitative and qualitative data. These teams will monitor student performance data to ensure that we are on track to meeting our goals. These teams will track/share out the performance of our 4 subgroups that are performing under the federal index (FRL, BLK, SWD, HSP).

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	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History	2021-22: D 2019-20: C 2018-19: C

	2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	15	11	12	8	12	0	0	0	59	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	8	13	0	0	0	25	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	10	11	0	0	0	24	
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		

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	4	6	8	0	0	0	18

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	4	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	16	18	18	8	15	0	0	0	77	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	16	18	18	8	15	0	0	0	77	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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*	45	55	56	46	54	57
ELA Learning Gains	47	62	61	47	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53	55	52	33	54	53
Math Achievement*	31	62	60	52	61	63
Math Learning Gains	36	65	64	56	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	22	54	55	39	48	51
Science Achievement*	34	57	51	45	53	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	268
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
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	29	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	21	Yes	3	1
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	34	Yes	1	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

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	45	47	53	31	36	22	34					

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	22	44		9	41	30						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	24		8	29	30	8					
HSP	33	55		44	25							
MUL	45			55								
PAC												
WHT	67	57		41	44		55					
FRL	37	38	58	29	33	23	20					

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	38	36		34	25		39					
SWD	12			12								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19	17		9	0		0					
HSP	39			29								
MUL	45			55								
PAC												
WHT	51	50		49	38		61					
FRL	33	30		27	19		41					

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	46	47	33	52	56	39	45					
SWD	15	30	24	20	33	28	18					
ELL												
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	21	36	31	30	52	53	20					
HSP	57	50		54	56		45					
MUL	63	58		69	58							
PAC												
WHT	61	50		64	52	30	71					
FRL	42	42	35	46	52	40	42					

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	60%	57%	3%	54%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	58%	-12%	58%	-12%
03	2023 - Spring	53%	53%	0%	50%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	46%	62%	-16%	59%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	66%	-6%	61%	-1%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	61%	-18%	55%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	60%	3%	51%	12%

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.

The 22-23 SY lowest performance data component was our math proficiency. While it was our lowest component, we showed a 19% increase from the previous year.

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

Each data component that was measured during the 22-23 SY showed significant growth. Our overall ELA proficiency increased from 45% to 56% (+11%), overall math proficiency increased from 31% to 50% (+ 19%), and overall science proficiency increased from 34% to 64% (+30%). No decline was noted in the data.

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.

When compared to the state average, our

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

Our science proficiency showed the most improvement, from 34% to 64%. This can be attributed to the hiring of a full-time science coach that co-taught science instruction in our 5th grade science classrooms.

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

Student attendance and discipline are areas of concern that will be addressed this year.

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

Our priorities this year are:

- Increase achievement in our subgroups that are performing below the federal index
- Teacher clarity/Instructional Practice to provide high-quality standards based instruction
- Making Data Informed Decisions
- Providing targeted supports for all students to make a learning gain

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.

Our current performance for ELA is 55%. Our 5th graders scored at the highest proficiency at 63%. Our 3rd and 4th graders combined proficiency is only 51%. Our focus will continue in ELA due to the lower percentage rates of those 3rd and 4th graders.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all 3-5 students achieving proficiency in ELA will increase from 55% to 57% as measured by the PM3 FAST ELA Assessment. The percent of L25 students making learning gains in ELA will increase to 70% as measured by the PM3 FAST ELA Assessment. The percent of all 3-5 students making learning gains will increase to 50% as measured by the FAST ELA Assessment. The percent of K-2 students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 73% to 75 % as measured by the STAR Early Literacy/STAR Reading Assessment.

Grade 3 proficiency will increase to 50% as measured by PM3 FAST ELA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

-Weekly PLCs utilizing multiple assessments as well as utilizing district comparison groups with a lens on subgroups performance. PLCs will have a next step/s action plan and will be monitored by administration and content coach

Star Early Literacy for K and 1st

-Star Reading for 2nd

-ELFAC data will drive primary small group instruction

-Running records school wide every 6 weeks for students not at/meeting expectation and 3 times per year for students who are meeting expectation.

-module assessments

-PM1 PM2 and PM3 for statewide assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Jones (jonesjuli@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.)

Core standard based instruction with daily designed tasks to assess performance toward proficiency on standards

Primary grades will use the Flamingo small group model

Intermediate grades will utilize the district accelerated learning plans in small group

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strong core instruction with grade level tasks will set high expectations for all learners.

Flamingo model is used because we are a PELI school and have a k-2 coach that will support this work.

Accelerating small group instruction will support students in accelerating toward proficiency and is aligned to the core content of instruction

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

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

Weekly collaborative planning with a focus on the standard and daily task.

Person Responsible: Heather Toledo (toledoh@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going

Professional development on Flaming Model for new teachers

Person Responsible: Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

By When: September

Calendar out designated PLCS for ELA assessments (module, ELFAC, writing, running records, PM1, 2 and PM3)

Person Responsible: Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

By When: August 21, 2023

PLC reflection forms will include next steps based on comparison reports on above subgroups

Person Responsible: Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

By When: August 21st, 2023

Daily walkthroughs and a collection of building trends for core instruction, small group instruction and daily task alignments.

-Core (plan implementation and daily tasks)

-small group (Flamingo plans and Acceleration plans)

Person Responsible: Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going

Professional Development and planning on Acceleration groups in grades 3-5

Person Responsible: Heather Toledo (toledoh@pcsb.org)

By When: Early September

Professional Development and planning centered around small group, differentiated instruction for Reading Recovery teachers.

Person Responsible: Nikishia Dixon (dixonni@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#2. 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.

Our current level of performance in (3-5) mathematics is 50% as evidenced by the 2023 Cambium assessment. We expect a 2% increase (52%) in student achievement in mathematics on the Spring 2024 Cambium assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all 3-5 students achieving proficiency in math will increase from 50% to 52% as measured by the FAST Mathematics Assessment. The percent of L25 students making learning gains in math will increase to 70% as measured by the FAST Mathematics Assessment. The percent of all 3-5 students making learning gains will increase to 50% as measured by the FAST mathematics Assessment. The percent of K-2 students achieving math proficiency will increase from 67% to 69% as measured by the STAR Math Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area will be monitored by a review of unit assessment, exit tickets, walkthrough, and I-Ready performance data. Ongoing monitoring of desired EOY outcomes will also occur during grade level data chats, SBLT, and ILT meetings. The Instructional Leadership Team will conduct weekly walkthroughs and track grade level and independent progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nikishia Dixon (dixonni@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.)

Support and strengthen staff ability to utilize data to plan for differentiation intervention, and scaffold core instruction to increase student achievement. Ensure that teachers plan for regular assessment opportunities (both formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was implemented with the support of instructional coaches last year and yielded a 19% increase in mathematics achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions with the math coach.

Person Responsible: Nikishia Dixon (dixonni@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

In PLC's led by the math coach, teachers will use comparative data to identify learning gaps and plan for remediation of specific benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Nikishia Dixon (dixonni@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Match Coach will engage staff in ongoing professional development on areas of need based on weekly walkthrough trend data.

Person Responsible: Nikishia Dixon (dixonni@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Math Coach will monitor and provide feedback on consistent effective instruction that promotes student centered with rigor for all mathematics instruction.

Person Responsible: Nikishia Dixon (dixonni@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Math Coach will ensure teachers have a deep understanding of the K-5 adopted B.E.S.T Math benchmarks and small group differentiated instruction to support the individual needs of scholars.

Person Responsible: Nikishia Dixon (dixonni@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Using the Equity Centered Problem-Solving process, our SBLT will continue to develop data-driven interventions that eliminate educational inequities and improve student outcomes.

Person Responsible: Nikishia Dixon (dixonni@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Math coach will:

- plan and model standards-based instruction, implementing feedback based on the Marzano LSI practices with teachers, through coaching cycles.
- provide teachers with resources and support in a non-evaluative way
- Chair Math SIP Goal
- Monitoring the implementation of math actions steps and strategies to increase student achievement in math including Math and STEM Family Nights
- Lead Math Parent University workshops with parents to ensure that they have the resources to support their scholars at home in the area of mathematics.
- Provide support in the five areas of instructional support for teachers: theory underlying instruction, demonstration of activities, observation of teachers practicing new lessons, feedback and reflection about instruction, and supporting collaboration among teachers weekly in our grade level professional learning communities
- help teachers interpret assessment information and use that information to provide more focused instruction

Person Responsible: Nikishia Dixon (dixonni@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#3. 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.

Our current level of performance in 5th grade science is 64% as evidenced by the 2023 SSA. We expect a 2% increase (66%) in student achievement in science on the Spring 2024 SSA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all 5th grade students achieving proficiency will increase from 64% to 66% as measured by the 2024 SSA.

Monitoring:

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

This area will be monitored by a review of unit assessment, exit tickets, and walkthrough trend data. It will also be monitored through the implementation of a comprehensive science review plan that identifies learning gaps in specific standards and specific review tasks. Ongoing monitoring of desired EOY outcomes will also occur during grade level comparative data chats. The Instructional Leadership Team will conduct weekly walkthroughs and track grade level and independent progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katheirne Braungart (braungartk@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.)

Support and strengthen staff ability to utilize data to plan for differentiation, intervention, and scaffold core instruction to increase student achievement. This will be completed through collaborative planning with the Science Coach using the district science curriculum materials. Ensure that teachers plan for regular assessment opportunities (both formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was implemented with the support of the science coach last year and yielded a 30% increase in science achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will participate in Collaborative planning sessions with the science coach to plan standards-based science instruction, prior to presenting the content to students. They will plan out questions, formative assessment strategies, and specific standards-aligned materials that will be used to teach each unit.

Person Responsible: Katheirne Braungart (braungartk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Science Coach will facilitate the use comparative data with teachers to identify learning gaps and plan to small group instruction tailored at closing those gaps.

Person Responsible: Katheirne Braungart (braungartk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Science Coach will monitor science instruction and provide feedback on consistent effective instruction.

Person Responsible: Katheirne Braungart (braungartk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Science Coach will:

- plan and model standards-based instruction, implementing feedback based on the Marzano LSI practices with teachers, through coaching cycles.
- Provides teachers with resources and support in a non-evaluative way
- Chair our Science SIP goal
- Monitoring the implementation of actions steps and strategies to increase student achievement in science.
- Provides support in the five areas of instructional support for teachers: theory underlying instruction, demonstration of activities, observation of teachers practicing new lessons, feedback and reflection about instruction, and supporting collaboration amongst teachers
- Helping teachers interpret assessment information and use that information to provide more focused instruction based on student needs.

Person Responsible: Katheirne Braungart (braungartk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Science Coach will plan for students to be engaged in real-world learning experiences (field-trips) that connect classroom learning to science in the real-world.

Person Responsible: Katheirne Braungart (braungartk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#4. 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.

To improve our school culture, we will foster positive relationships. This is important because we have ___% of our students that are homeless or temporarily living with others. We also have students that reside in transitional housing (Sallie House Shelter and Children's visit). To help all students feel a sense of belonging regardless of their home environment, we will intentionally work to improve the culture of the school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will improve the overall school culture by increasing positive student/teacher relationships, reducing referrals by 50% through the use of positive reinforcement and Zones of Regulations.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this Area of Focus through student/teacher surveys, continuous monitoring of discipline data and, fidelity of Zones of Regulation implementation on a quarterly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Trotter (trottera@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.)

The interventions that will be used are the PBIS Rewards Advanced Referral System and the Zones of Regulations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Zones of Regulation is a metacognitive framework for regulation and treatment approach that is based on immense evidence in the fields of autism, attention deficit disorders (ADD/HD), and social-emotional theories. It

integrates best practices around Trauma Informed Care and mental health supports and aligns with the CASEL SEL core competencies.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

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

Facilitate student/teacher surveys to gather information on the positive relationships that are established..

Person Responsible: Angela Trotter (trottera@pcsb.org)

By When: Quarterly; every marking period

Analyze teacher/student survey data as well as schoolwide discipline data and share with all stakeholders. Engage the SBLT in the Equity Centered Problem-Solving Process.

Person Responsible: Angela Trotter (trottera@pcsb.org)

By When: Quarterly; every marking period

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).

Pinellas County Schools Superintendent and the Pinellas County School Board have invested in a strong support structure that creates an increasing number of strategies and interventions to support schools in need. The district has robust systems, processes, and measures to continually review the progress in the schools in support of their continued improvement. Data review has informed the various aspects of this plan. It connects several ongoing monitoring systems to support the schools in alignment with the domains for school turnaround: Effective Leadership, Collaborative Teaching, Ambitious Instruction and Learning, Safe and Supportive Environment, and Family and Community Engagement. The Leadership Team will continue to meet weekly to monitor the progress of our Differentiated Accountability (DA) schools. Issues identified in the process include but are not limited to the following: teacher concerns, staffing model, technology, facilities, instructional practices, the effectiveness of School-based Leadership Teams, coaching support model, allocation of resources, progress monitoring, and student performance. The team evaluates identified issues weekly and establishes a plan of action to resolve them effectively and efficiently.

A large portion of our Title 1 and UniSIG funds are used to purchase Instructional Staff Developers (ISD) for Math and Science. These ISD's facilitate weekly collaborative planning sessions with staff, provide professional development based on trend data, provide coaching to teachers, and are directly tied to student achievement. This year, the coaching model has been refined to include ISD's being the teacher of record for a specific cohort of students. Additional money is allocated to resources that are used to support core instruction and academic interventions based on assessment data. We will continue to collaborate with Title 1 and the UniSIG Grant manager to ensure that allocated funds are meeting the needs of all learners.

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

Although the percentage of students in grades K-2 performing below the 40th percentile was not below 50%, we will focus on the implementation of the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative (PELI) with fidelity; focusing on VPK-2 classrooms ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback to grow instructional practice.

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

Overall, 55% of 3-5 students were proficient on PM3 of the FAST Assessment. However, 52% of last year's 4th graders (current 5th graders) scored below a Level 3 on PM3 Fast Assessment. To improve literacy achievement in grades 3-5, we will use our embedded Literacy Coach to implement coaching cycles centered around evidence-based practices to strengthen our core literacy instruction across grades 3-5.

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

Last year in grades K-2, no grade level had over 50% of their scholars to perform below the 40th percentile on their PM3 STAR Early Literacy/STAR Reading Assessment. However, to increase literacy achievement we will implement the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative (PELI) with fidelity. With full implementation, the percent of K-2 students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 73% to 75 % as measured by the PM3 STAR Early Literacy/STAR Reading Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Last year in grades 3 and 5, over 50 % of our scholars scored a Level 3 or above on the PM3 FAST Assessment. In 4th grade, however, 52% of our scholars scored below a level 3. To increase literacy achievement, we will focus on using our Literacy Coach to implement coaching cycles to improve instructional practices of our classroom teachers. By fully implementing coaching cycles, the percent of all 3-5 students achieving proficiency in ELA will increase from 55% to 57% as measured by the PM3 FAST ELA Assessment. The percent of L25 students making learning gains in ELA will increase to 50% as measured by the PM3 FAST ELA Assessment. The percent of all 3-5 students making learning gains will increase to 50% as measured by the FAST ELA Assessment. Grade 3 proficiency will increase to 50% as measured by PM3 FAST 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.

To monitor our desired outcomes we will:

- Implement weekly PLCs utilizing multiple assessments as well as utilizing district comparison groups with a lens on subgroups performance. PLCs will have a next step/s action plan and will be monitored by administration and our literacy coach.
- Use Star Early Literacy for K and 1st Star Reading for 2nd to progress monitor scholar progress
- Use ELFAC data to drive primary small group instruction
- Complete Running Records school-wide every 6 weeks for scholars not at/meeting expectations and 3 times per year for scholars who are meeting expectation.
- Use module assessments as another data source to track scholar performance based on specific benchmarks taught; facilitate comparative data chats to see how our scholars are progressing towards mastery of specific benchmarks
- PM1 PM2 and PM3 for statewide assessments

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jones, Julie, jonesjuli@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?

To achieve our outcomes we will do the following evidence- based practices:

In grades K-2 we will fully implement the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative (PELI) which will engage

scholars in print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction. We will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words. We will provide instruction in broad oral language skills and teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies. We will ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

In grades 3-5, our literacy coach will prioritize time to those teachers, activities, and roles that will have the greatest impact on scholar achievement in reading, mainly coaching, modeling, and mentoring in classrooms daily. Our literacy coach will create a model classroom to support growing the instructional practices of our classroom teachers. PLC's will be guided by assessment data that is collected systematically and our literacy coach will support and train our teachers to analyze and use assessment data to differentiate instruction/meet the individual needs of learners.

Rationale:

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

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

To develop literacy, students need instruction in two related sets of skills: foundational reading skills and reading comprehension skills. Employing the evidence-based strategies and action steps will enable students to read words (alphabets), relate those words to their oral language, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency to understand what they read. This level of instruction comes from teachers that have a skillset to make data informed decisions to meet the individual needs of learners. The skillset comes from being engaged in professional learning opportunities that are planned, purposeful, directly connected to student success.

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
Instructional Leadership Team meets weekly to look at data to make informed decisions about what professional learning and supports need to be in place to maximize student achievement in reading.	Jones, Julie, jonesjuli@pcsb.org
Administrative/School Literacy Leadership Team supports the full implementation of PELI in grades VPK-2.	Galdames, Patricia, galdamesp@pcsb.org
Literacy coach to create a model classroom to coach, model, mentor, and teach evidence-based practices that support increased student achievement in reading.	Jones, Julie, jonesjuli@pcsb.org
Literacy coach to facilitate weekly collaborative planning sessions in which they work with classroom teachers to plan and implement standards-based instruction.	Jones, Julie, jonesjuli@pcsb.org
ILT to facilitate data chats in which ongoing formative assessment is in place to determine where instruction should be modified to meet individual scholar needs.	Jones, Julie, jonesj@pcsb.org
Literacy Leadership Team will support the growth of teachers by facilitating Instructional Rounds and providing feedback specifically around the use of best-practices in literacy.	Jones, Julie, jonesjuli@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.

To disseminate the SIP, UniSIG budget, and SWP to all stakeholders, we will maintain the Title 1 parent corner in the front office of the school. This corner will show/display all information related to the Title 1 services/events that are provided with the use of Title 1 funds. We will also create an online Title 1 corner in which we will virtually share Title 1 information on the school website. We will hold the Annual Title 1 Meeting, giving parents the option to view it virtually or access a recording of the meeting in our online Title 1 corner. We will use the following modalities to consistently keep parents informed:

- PBIS App (daily usage)
- Weekly Parent Communication on Website
- Monthly Newsletter
- School Facebook page
- Flyers/handouts

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))

To build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders we will:

- Develop a Family Engagement Committee to lead our family engagement goals
- Facilitate Monthly FEC Meetings
- Implement Parent Support Card program; parents are recognized/receive incentives for actively engaging in their child's education.
- Host Family Engagement events, including Parent University, that connect parents to the classroom
- Invite vendors that provide services to families centered around the needs identified from parent surveys.

We will implement these activities to support our school and families in understanding the resources we have available here at Mt. Vernon and how they can be utilized to support our students with academic, behavior and social emotional learning. Parents will have a thorough understanding of resources like Focus, I-Ready, PBIS, Canvas and how to use these resources at home to extend and support student learning.

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)

To strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, we will establish priorities related to each content area and the culture of the school. We will foster positive relationships between students and staff. We will engage our staff in professional development that supports the implementation of a rigorous, standards-based instructional program that meets the needs of all learners. We will engage families in learning opportunities centered around the resources that are provided/available for them to utilize to support their students outside of the classroom.

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

Not applicable

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				\$9,105.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24

	6400	330	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG		\$6,833.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/travel: Three staff (one administrator and two teacher/leaders) will attend the Lit Con 2024 Conference (January 27-30, Columbus, OH). This professional development is an interactive, immersive learning experience where attendees choose from 100+ powerful sessions and workshops from literacy experts, authors, and colleagues on topics from five learning strands. Designed by and for educators, LitCon sessions focus on best instructional practices for: Classroom teachers, Literacy coaches & specialists, Building & district administrators, Title I teachers and coordinators, Interventionists & teachers of Multilingual Learners, Curriculum & language arts specialists, and Reading Recovery professionals. Estimated cost for each teacher participant includes membership \$80, registration \$485, registration for leadership conference for administrator \$320, meals, \$256 (4 days x \$64/day), mileage/parking/ride shares \$200, airfare \$350, and lodging \$800 (4 nights @ \$200/night) = \$2,171. Total cost for 3 attendees = \$6,833 (\$2,171 x 2 teachers + \$2,171 + \$320 for administrator).			
	6400	140	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG		\$2,240.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/substitute teacher: We plan to hold a day of onsite professional development in which we will disaggregate assessment data to identify learning gaps shown on assessments and plan for differentiated, small group instruction that meets the needs of individual learners. We will plan remediation through small group instruction. 16 classroom teachers will participate in this professional development focused on increasing knowledge of instructional practices that directly impact student outcomes in ELA. The cost of a substitute teacher is \$140 per day. Total cost = \$2,240 (\$140 x 16 teachers).			
	6400	220	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG		\$32.50
			Notes: Instruction, basic/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Social Security medical taxes for substitutes (1.45%).			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$53,702.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	130	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.43	\$28,596.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/other certified: Base salary for an instructional staff developer (ISD) focusing on math. This position will focus on supporting students and teachers. The math ISD will be working on creating small group instructions, rotations, and remediation pull out sessions with the struggling math students. The ISD position will be split between two schools.			
	6400	210	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.43	\$3,881.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/retirement. Math ISD retirement contribution (13.57%).			
	6400	220	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.43	\$2,188.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Math ISD FICA taxes (7.65%).			
	6400	230	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.43	\$5,695.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/group insurance. Math ISD group insurance (average \$13,245).			
	5100	120	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.07	\$4,655.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/classroom teacher: The math ISD position will teach one class of math. The ISD's class will present instructional practices in a model/demonstration classroom setting for observation by all math instructors. The math ISD position will be split between two schools.			

	5100	210	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.07	\$632.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/retirement: Math ISD retirement contribution (13.57%).</i>			
	5100	220	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.07	\$356.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Math ISD FICA taxes (7.65%).</i>			
	5100	230	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.07	\$927.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/group insurance. Math ISD group insurance (average \$13,245).</i>			
	6400	330	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG		\$4,500.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/travel: Florida Council of Teachers of Mathematics conference focuses on alignment to standards and instructional strategies. It will be held in June 2024 in Orlando, Florida. Estimated costs: registration/membership \$125pp, lodging \$900 (\$300/night x 3 nights), meals \$192 (\$64/day x 3 days), mileage/parking \$283 = \$1,500 per attendee. Estimated cost for three attendees = \$4,500 (\$1,500 x 3).</i>			
	6400	140	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG		\$2,240.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/substitute teacher: We plan to hold a day of onsite professional development in which we will disaggregate assessment data to identify learning gaps shown on assessments and plan for differentiated, small group instruction that meets the needs of individual learners. We will plan remediation through small group instruction. 16 classroom teachers will participate in this professional development focused on increasing knowledge of instructional practices that directly impact student outcomes in Math. The cost of a substitute teacher is \$140 per day. Total cost = \$2,240 (\$140 x 16 teachers).</i>			
	6400	220	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG		\$32.50
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Social Security medical taxes for substitutes (1.45%).</i>			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$83,775.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	130	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.86	\$46,200.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/other certified: Base salary for an instructional staff developer (ISD) focusing on science. This position will work with teachers on understanding and unpacking the standards, creating lessons that ensure target/task alignment, using hands-on learning techniques and concepts that are relevant and meaningful to improving student achievement.</i>			
	6400	210	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.86	\$6,270.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/retirement. Science ISD retirement contribution (13.57%).</i>			
	6400	220	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.86	\$3,535.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Science ISD FICA taxes (7.65%).</i>			
	6400	230	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.86	\$11,390.00

			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/group insurance. Science ISD group insurance (average \$13,245).</i>			
	5100	120	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.14	\$7,521.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/classroom teacher: The science ISD position will teach one class of science. The ISD's class will present instructional practices in a model/demonstration classroom setting for observation by all science instructors.</i>			
	5100	210	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.14	\$1,021.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/retirement: Science ISD retirement contribution (13.57%).</i>			
	5100	220	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.14	\$575.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Science ISD FICA taxes (7.65%).</i>			
	5100	230	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG	0.14	\$1,854.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/group insurance. Science ISD group insurance (average \$13,245).</i>			
	5100	330	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,735.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/travel: Field Trips will be attended by our science scholars to enhance the classroom learning experience. These can include trips to: Tampa Bay Watch (grades K-2) and the Clearwater Marine Aquarium (grades 3-5), offering programs directly tied to all grade level content areas. Estimated costs for Tampa Bay Watch = \$750 (3 program days @ \$250/day [50 students per day]. Estimated costs for Clearwater Aquarium = \$2,985 (2 program days @ \$1,492.50/day [150 tickets x \$9.95 per day]). Transportation is a separate budget line.</i>			
	7800	390	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,674.00
			<i>Notes: Student transportation services/other purchased services: Estimated costs for Tampa Bay Watch \$322 (one bus per program day x 2 days x \$161) and Clearwater Aquarium = \$1,353 (one bus per program day = 3 buses x \$451).</i>			
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$7,586.11
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	130	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG		\$5,200.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/travel: Two staff (one administrator and one teacher/leader) will attend the Roy Clark Association (RCA) House Mania Conference. This professional development is an interactive, immersive learning experience where attendees observe classes and participate in dynamic workshops teaching how to create and enhance the house system in a way that transforms the school environment, creates a sense of belonging for all students and families, ignites a passion for learning, provides meaningful support, encourages academic excellence and a climate and culture where all students and staff thrive. Estimated cost for each participant includes registration \$1,050, meals \$192 (3 days x \$64/day), mileage/parking/ride shares \$208, airfare \$250, and lodging \$900 (3 nights @ \$300/night) = \$2,600 per person. Total cost for 2 attendees = \$5,200 (\$2,600 x 2 attendees).</i>			
	5100	510	2531 - Mount Vernon Elementary School	UniSIG		\$2,386.11
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/supplies: Instructional materials and supplies supporting instructional delivery such as paper, pencils, sheet protectors, copies, composition books, etc.</i>			
Total:						\$161,096.25

Budget Approval

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

No