

Pinellas County Schools

Ozona 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	12
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Ozona Elementary School

601 TAMPA RD, Palm Harbor, FL 34683

<http://www.ozona-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.

Ozona's mission is to create highest student achievement, in collaboration with the school community, by developing the whole child in a safe environment, using effective learning systems to close the opportunity gap by preparing all students for career & college readiness and success in a global society.

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
Freeman, Lisa	Principal	The duties include but are not limited to promoting and maintaining high student achievement by shaping a vision of academic success for all students, providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school operations, ensuring a safe learning environment, cultivating leadership in others and maintaining a school climate that is supportive to the needs of staff, students and families.
Downes, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader, curriculum and instruction manager, supports, Early Childhood learning, SIP goals, assists in monitoring data, school testing coordinator, teacher evaluations and walk throughs, discipline, Family Engagement, Safety/Emergency Drills, Transportation, CST, MTSS member, PBIS
Repetosky, Nicola	School Counselor	See Something, Say Something coordinator, MTSS facilitator, bully investigator, 504 coordinator, gifted coordinator, SAVE coordinator, provides guidance lessons whole group/small group. Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Strausbaugh, Vanessa	Behavior Specialist	PBIS/Restorative practice, ensures supports are in place and monitors (FBAs), assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Narkier, Jennifer	Instructional Media	Library Media Technician Provides leadership and expertise to ensure the school library media/technology program is aligned with the mission, goals and objectives of both the district and the school, and is an integral component of the instructional program providing equitable access to diverse information formats. Instills a love of learning and empowers students to be critical thinkers, enthusiastic readers, producers of digital content, savvy technology users, skillful researchers, and ethical users of information.
Evans, Barrie	Other	AVID Coordinator & 4th grade teacher Works with District AVID ISD, leads site based AVID Team

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Matthews, Amy	Teacher, PreK	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Light, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Hering, Sheryl	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Danneman, Carolyn	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Knauff, Jeanne	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Hollenbeck, Bridgett	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Russell, Alexis	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Miller, Colleen	Teacher, ESE	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Magee, Margaret	Teacher, ESE	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Keller, Elizabeth		Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Teig, Jordie		Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support, data monitoring and budgeting.
Turner, Michelle	Psychologist	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.

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.

We utilize our School Leadership Team (Administrators, Team Leaders, Secretary, Student Support Service members) and SAC comprised of school staff to include support and instructional members, parent members and community members from Palm Harbor Library & Huntington Learning Center. We analyze STAR/FAST PM cycle data and other data relevant to our goal areas, discuss/monitor current goals & actions steps, discuss best practices and determine the next steps in goal setting & actions to create a draft. After the draft plan is developed, goals and action steps are adjusted based on the feedback of our SAC prior to the final vote of the plan.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP is monitored after each of our district assessment cycles to measure student performance trends in meeting our goals. We also review sections of our SIP through monthly SIP Teaching & Learning meetings, PLCs or site-embedded professional development. Through the work of our MTSS & SBLT we progress monitor our student subgroups focusing on those with the largest achievement gaps to determine if interventions are having a positive impact on student learning and if the achievement gap

is closing. A mid-year reflection and 90 day action plan are also developed and implemented to address any identified deficiencies. Revisions are made to 90 day action plan as needed.

Potential revisions to the SIP are reviewed following each district assessment cycle, as well as after each grading period.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	19%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	34%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
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	16	18	13	7	13	0	0	0	67	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	7	2	2	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	5	3	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	8	11	0	0	0	23	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	7	10	0	0	0	20	
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	1	1	4	5	8	0	0	0	19

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	29	17	15	14	12	0	0	0	88	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	19	16	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	9	18	0	0	0	35	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	1	4	0	5	16	0	0	0	29	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	29	17	15	14	12	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	19	16	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	9	18	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	1	4	0	5	16	0	0	0	29

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
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*	68	55	56	69	54	57
ELA Learning Gains	65	62	61	69	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54	55	52	58	54	53
Math Achievement*	79	62	60	73	61	63
Math Learning Gains	66	65	64	70	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47	54	55	53	48	51
Science Achievement*	67	57	51	69	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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	446
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	69			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	50			

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	68	65	54	79	66	47	67					
SWD	23	25	19	49	41	25	24					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	67	67		85	62		65					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69	66	57	78	67	51	69					
FRL	49	48	38	64	56	52	40					

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	66	66	38	72	68	50	66					
SWD	26	38		43	69	55	53					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	62	46		65	42		33					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67	71	40	73	74	67	72					
FRL	48	56	46	53	58	43	50					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	69	69	58	73	70	53	69					
SWD	34	50	46	48	60	55	50					
ELL	55			62	80							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	66	71		57	60							
MUL	80			80								
PAC												
WHT	69	69	57	75	70	55	71					
FRL	53	58	55	60	72	55	53					

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	59%	57%	2%	54%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	58%	21%	58%	21%
03	2023 - Spring	70%	53%	17%	50%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	79%	62%	17%	59%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	66%	19%	61%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	71%	61%	10%	55%	16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	60%	6%	51%	15%

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.

ELA proficiency is our lowest performing component.

Contributing factors: It was the first year rolling out the B.E.S.T. standards, in addition to a new reading curriculum. Teachers continue to build understanding of the science of reading and how that is integrated into instruction.

Strength of teaching was in Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary, with Figurative Language being the exception.

Central Idea and Theme need to be taught using the BEST Standards Resource & Strategy district-created documents in addition to the blue Florida's BEST Standards ELA benchmarks & clarifications book, this will ensure we are teaching to the depth and breadth of the benchmarks.

ELA phonics instructional routines (Fun with Phonics) were not formally in place when current 3rd, 4th & 5th grade students were in primary grades. The trend shows the proficiency gap between Math and ELA is growing by at approximately 6 percent from 2019-2023.

Our SWD Reading proficiency (37%) is trending up (+14%) however it is significantly below all other subgroups. SWD students do not routinely practice skills in grade level texts as an additional small group intervention.

SWD students score is significantly lower than all subgroups in Science.

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

Science proficiency is flatlining.

Science instructional time is when students are pulled for ESE services and 4th & 5th grade students are pulled for chorus. Essentially a child receiving Speech services and in chorus could miss 3 instructional days of science. When more instructional time is needed in reading & math, science instructional minutes often get cut.

Teachers need understand vertical progression of science standards.

SWD students score is significantly lower than all subgroups in Science.

The 2021 3rd grade cohort has declined in Reading proficiency declined from 66% to 59% in 2023 as 5th graders.

5th grade scores in 2022 were 67% proficient and declined to 59% proficient in 2023.

Central Idea and Theme need to be taught using the BEST Standards Resource & Strategy district-created documents in addition to the blue Florida's BEST Standards ELA benchmarks & clarifications book, this will ensure we are teaching to the depth and breadth of the benchmarks.

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 Proficiency Results PM3

Ozona 3rd-5th grade 70%; State 3rd-5th grade: 54%; District 3rd-5th grade:56%

Math Proficiency Results PM3

Ozona 3rd-5th grade 79%; State 3rd-5th grade: 58%; District 3rd-5th grade:63%

Science (SSA) Proficiency

Ozona 5th grade: 67%; State 5th grade: 51%; District 5th grade:60%

Individual Grade Levels 3rd-5th scored higher than the State & District in both Reading and Math FAST PM3

Reading FAST PM3

3rd: Ozona 71%; State 50%; District 53%

4th: Ozona 79%; State 58%; District 57%

5th: Ozona 58%; State 54%; District 57%

Math FAST PM3

3rd: Ozona 79%; State 59%; District 62%

4th: Ozona 85%; State 61%; District 66%

5th: Ozona 72%; State 55%; District 61%

5th grade Reading is closest to the State & District average, being the lowest level of proficiency among the 3rd, 4th & 5th grades.

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

SWD Reading proficiency showed the most improvement (+14%), however the proficiency level remains the lowest of all subgroups.

We gained a VE Resource teacher in December.

Gifted Reading and Gifted Math Proficiency Level 4's & 5's

Gifted Reading

5th: 93%

4th: 100%

3rd: 88%

Gifted Math

5th: 100%

4th: 100%

3rd: 100%

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

Attendance

Grades 3-5 failing Reading grades

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

1) SWD proficiency with ELA core

2) Science core score increase

3) Learning gains for all

4) Learning gains for L35

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

Area of Focus: Planning scaffolded questions to match the rigor of the benchmark while building content knowledge.

Rationale: Standards-based data (FAST, unit assessment data, walkthrough/observation data, etc.)

collected and reviewed from the 2022-2023 school year showed gaps in performance in all content areas. Our SWD students are underperforming. These same trends emerged in our 504 student performance when compared to overall school-wide ELA, Math & Science proficiency.

Our feedback from our AVID Elementary WICOR and Culture Walkthrough indicates that there is an opportunity to increase evidence schoolwide of higher-level questioning and use of Costa's Levels of Thinking. Marzano observations indicate that there is opportunity to increase utilizing questioning to push into higher levels of thinking.

After careful discussion and analysis of the data it was determined that students are not being provided with the opportunity to respond to questions that require deeper thinking, and that we remain rooted in Level 1 and Level 2 questions/tasks no matter the standard. There is a lack of consistency in tasks/questions aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks and higher levels of questioning.

In addition, the AVID CCI Survey reflects that there are pockets of students across various grade levels and content areas actively participate in questioning and Costa's Levels of Thinking during class lessons, discussions and problem-solving activities.

Our current level of performance in ELA as measured by the FSA is 70% proficient.

Our current level of performance in Math as measured by the FSA is 79% proficient.

Our current level of performance in Science as measured by SSA is 67% proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By October 2023, at least 80% of instructional staff will plan and implement higher level questioning as evidenced in walk-throughs, formal evaluations and ISM data.

By December 2023, 100% of instructional staff will plan and implement higher level questioning as evidenced in walk-throughs, formal evaluations and ISM data. 50% of students will begin generating/creating higher order questions.

The percentage of students achieving ELA proficiency of Level 3 or higher will be 75%.

The percentage of students achieving Math proficiency of Level 3 or higher will be 85%.

The percentage of students achieving Science proficiency of Level 3 or higher will be 75%.

Black student proficiency in ELA and Math will increase 5% as measured by FAST assessments. (ELA=71%, Math=100%). Black student proficiency in Science as measured by the SSA will increase to 62%.

The above goals will be measured by the 2024 state approved standardized assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Administrative walk-throughs

Unit/module assessments using Comparative Data reports during PLCs

MTSS review of grade level data

Report card grades

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Freeman (freemanl@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.)

Teachers will gain a deeper understanding on how to plan and deliver lessons aligned to the B.E.S.T Standards/FSASS (Florida's State Academic Standards for Science) to include criteria to push "elevate" questions higher, as well as align tasks to those standards.

Students actively participate in questioning and Costa's levels of Thinking during class lessons, discussions and problem-solving activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By asking higher levels of questions, students deepen their knowledge and create connections to the material being presented, which in turn prepares them for inquiry.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Become familiar with the design in order to understand what students are expected to master.

Person Responsible: Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Pre-test students in order to appropriately differentiate with leveled or tiered questions and/or tasks.

Person Responsible: Jessica Downes (downesj@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers intentionally plan and ask questions that progress to the top of Costa's Levels of Thinking. Teachers will plan utilizing the MTR's for Math to support those high quality task and opportunities to increase the DOK level.

Person Responsible: Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

By When: Planning will take place throughout the entire school year. Team Leaders will facilitate grade level team weekly lesson planning.

Provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark.

Person Responsible: Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Utilize AVID strategies: Intentionally plan (weekly) and deliver instruction that is engaging to students while allowing appropriate time for students to apply their learning (AVID strategies). This includes the use of Costa's Levels of Thinking (AVID), the use of Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards grades K-5, including ALDs and 3rd-5th and District Resource documents.

Person Responsible: Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Instructional staff will complete professional development and PLCs to better implement questioning with higher levels of thinking/Costa's Levels of Thinking.

Person Responsible: Barrie Evans (evansba@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

#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.

Our SWD Reading proficiency (37%) is trending up (+14%) however it is significantly below all other subgroups. SWD students do not routinely receive explicit and direct instruction using a multi-sensory approach to instruction. This includes small group instruction utilizing metacognitive strategies into content based instruction to teach students critical memory and engagement strategies (AVID) they can use to attain and access grade level content.

SWD students score is significantly lower than all subgroups in Math and Science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The ESE subgroup will make 60% learning gains in ELA and Math.

The percentage of ESE students achieving ELA proficiency of Level 3 or higher will be 50%.

The percentage of ESE students achieving Math proficiency of Level 3 or higher will be 50%

The percentage of ESE students achieving Science proficiency of Level 3 or higher will be 50%

The above goals will be measured by the 2024 state approved standardized assessment. (FAST PM 3 and Science SSA)

Monitoring:

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

Monitor exposure to direct and explicit instruction including modeling of skills along with guided practice grade until mastery is achieved. This includes the level of student engagement during walk-throughs/ observations (Administration) then provide feedback to support teacher growth.

ESE: Student progress will be monitored on this area of focus through data review cycles with teachers following each PM cycle. MTSS and Leadership Team will be analyzing data including formative assessments, reading records, Dreambox reports and other available data monthly.

During PLCs Comparative Results reports will be analyze, strategies for success shared with planned reteach and ongoing monitoring.

Students requiring ESE services work toward mastery of Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous grade level content in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Freeman (freemanl@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.)

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.

Students actively participate in questioning and Costa's Levels of Thinking during class lessons, discussions and problem-solving activities

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

Students will increase proficiency when they are given the opportunity to hear and respond to questions that go beyond the lower level of Costa's Level of Thinking to raise the rigor, and with scaffolded support, complete independent tasks that are tightly aligned to the rigor of the standards.

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.

Train staff on what SDI consists of

Person Responsible: Margaret Magee (mageem@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Provide teachers with updated high leverage practices

Person Responsible: Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

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

Person Responsible: Lisa Freeman (freemanl@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#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.

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To reinforce behaviors and expectations, a positive reward system is in place that includes classroom and schoolwide recognitions. Ozona Elementary School started using a PBIS Online Reward system to track and monitor student behavior and reinforcement of appropriate behaviors.

Monitoring:

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

We will be looking at grade specific behavior and location specific behavior to identify trends and increases in recognition of appropriate behaviors. (Guidelines for Success)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vanessa Strausbaugh (strausbaughv@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.)

Our interventions will be restorative practices and PBIS. These are research and evidence-based programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A multi-faceted approach to building a positive school culture and environment includes a positive behavior support, use of Restorative Practices with an equity mindset, attendance monitoring and support.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Identify the expected behaviors (Guidelines for Success),
2. Teach, model and practice what those behaviors look like, sound like, and feel like,
3. Specifically praise appropriate behavior with private or public acknowledgement, and
4. Measure outcome data to determine successes and barriers to reaching the desired goals.

Person Responsible: Jessica Downes (downesj@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

The process to review our school improvement funding allocations goes through our school advisory council (SAC). Data and need rationale is presented to SAC for approval to utilize funds for needed resources.

Pinellas - 0851 - Curlew Creek Elementary School - 2023-24 SIP

Last