

Pinellas County Schools

Sandy Lane 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Sandy Lane Elementary School

1360 SANDY LN, Clearwater, FL 33755

<http://www.sandylane-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.

Promote scholars to dream, believe, and achieve their personal, academic, and social-emotional goals through the arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

Core Values: Respect, Diversity, Collective Efficacy, and Building a strong community where all students can learn.

Theme: Breaking Barriers!

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
Austin, Kelly	Principal	Oversee all operations and instructional practices within the school
Brewster, Julie	Assistant Principal	Assists with all Operational and Instructional processes within the school
Richardson, Pamela	Instructional Coach	magnet coordinator for ARTS; instructional staff developer for arts integration; SIP chair for Culture and Climate
Rodriguez, Celimar	Instructional Coach	Science Coach; SIP Chair of Math/Science Committee
Santana, Christine	Instructional Coach	Math Coach; SIP Chair for Math/Science Committee
Rogers-Rush, Olivia	Instructional Coach	3-5 ELA Coach; Literacy Team Chair

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The Instructional Leadership team met weekly throughout the 22/23 school year to ensure that the SIP was followed. In January of 2023 revisions were made based on student data. Revisions were determined with staff through a collaborative carousel activity. Recommendations were determined and presented to the SAC committee and their input was also considered. Once all scores were available the ILT met to finalize decisions based on the feedback based on the feedback from all stakeholders in alignment with student data.

SIP Monitoring

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

All of our instructional practices, planning, and community building are grounded in our School Improvement Plan. We use a variety of assessments to monitor and track data. Using this information every quarter helps to assist us in revising the SIP throughout the school year.

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	86%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: D
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	20	12	18	12	14	0	0	0	77	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	12	6	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	19	12	0	0	0	45	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	4	6	1	5	1	0	0	0	20	
	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	3	3	1	12	12	10	0	0	0	41

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	8	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	27	25	19	25	13	21	0	0	0	130	
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	2	3	5	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in ELA	0	20	6	9	5	7	0	0	0	47	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	13	15	0	0	0	63	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	11	12	0	0	0	45	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	9	17	18	13	15	0	0	0	75	

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	1	1	0	1	9	5	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	27	25	19	25	13	21	0	0	0	130	
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	2	3	5	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in ELA	0	20	6	9	5	7	0	0	0	47	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	13	15	0	0	0	63	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	11	12	0	0	0	45	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	9	17	18	13	15	0	0	0	75	

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	1	1	0	1	9	5	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	11
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*	32	55	56	28	54	57
ELA Learning Gains	56	62	61	44	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52	55	52	39	54	53
Math Achievement*	44	62	60	46	61	63
Math Learning Gains	68	65	64	45	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70	54	55	35	48	51
Science Achievement*	40	57	51	27	53	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	71			73		

** 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Graduation Rate

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL	71			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	64			
MUL	25	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	54			

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	32	56	52	44	68	70	40					71
SWD	17	58		24	70							
ELL												71
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	58	53	38	67	86	29					
HSP	53			69								69
MUL	20			30								
PAC												

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
WHT	61	60		58	70							
FRL	32	54	50	43	67	68	37					83

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	24	35	50	32	43	38	30					64
SWD	13	50		15	25							
ELL												64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18	41		27	41	30	31					
HSP	14			50								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	39	25		41	54		38					
FRL	23	37	46	29	41	33	30					

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	28	44	39	46	45	35	27					73
SWD	12	37	38	28	43	38	14					
ELL												73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20	38	32	37	40	39	21					
HSP	43	67		61	53							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	36	50		59	56		45					
FRL	26	44	40	45	47	41	24					

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	39%	57%	-18%	54%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	58%	-19%	58%	-19%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	53%	5%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	53%	62%	-9%	59%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	28%	66%	-38%	61%	-33%
05	2023 - Spring	37%	61%	-24%	55%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	42%	60%	-18%	51%	-9%

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.

Our 4th grade cohort of students showed the lowest performance in math proficiency at 28%. The contributing factors were lack of student motivation, a novice math teacher, and the math coach was pulled to become a teacher of record in 5th grade.

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

Our attendance rate was a huge concern with students missing more than 10% of the school year. This became a focus in the 22/23 school year to improve. The CST met bi-weekly to problem solve and

support families. Intentionality of contacting parents anytime a student was absent sent the message that being present is critical. Administration met with families to show correlation between attendance and academic success. We decreased the number of students by 50% (130 to 62).

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

The greatest gap is with our 4th grade cohort in ELA being 27 points below the state and Math being 33 points below the state proficiency. The contributing factors were lack of student motivation, a novice math teacher, and the math coach was pulled to become a teacher of record in 5th grade. In reading, we had a long term sub in the position after the main teacher left after the first two weeks. The literacy coach worked with the long term sub every day the entire school year.

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

Our Kindergarten reading proficiency for spring is 71% which is only 3% behind the district average. First grade reading proficiency for spring is 74% which is 5% above the district average. Second grade reading proficiency is 65% which is only 2% below the district average. Our K-2 actions were intentionality with instruction using the Flamingo Literacy Model and adjusting groups every 6 to 8 weeks. Additionally, the strong and intentional professional development for staff in Early Literacy contributed to the growth. Our K-2 math proficiency was above the district average in all three grade levels due to intentionality with number sense and spiral review through data analysis to ensure student proficiency.

Our 3rd grade reading proficiency was 58% which was above the state and district average. The previous year's 3rd grade proficiency was at 26%. Our 3rd grade math proficiency showed an increase from 47% previous year to 53% current year. We have closed the gap with the state average from 11% to 6%. Using data consistently and adjusting instruction is what contributed to the growth with our 3rd grade cohort.

The 4th grade cohort increased their reading proficiency from 26% to 40%. The 5th grade cohort increased their reading proficiency from 18% to 41%. The 5th grade cohort increased their math proficiency from 30% to 41%. We intentionally utilized our staff's strengths to align with student needs to continuously make instructional adjustments based on the consistent use of student data.

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

Two concerns in EWS show our primary students have a large number of students absent 10% or more and the amount of Level 1 on the math state assessment is still high in grades 4 and 5.

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

1. Math proficiency in 3rd through 5th grade
2. Reading proficiency in 5th grade
3. Writing in K-5
4. Attendance

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Without a positive culture and environment, stake holders do not want to be present. In order to change this mindset of scholars who lack motivation to come to school, we will be intentional with our conditions for learning and community building in order to enhance and foster the student experience.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will decrease the number of students absent more than 10% of the school year from 24% to 15%.

Monitoring:

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

Bi-weekly meetings for CST will be held to review data and interventions to support students and families. CST dashboard will track our action plans for any student that is flagged.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Brewster (brewsterju@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.)

Conditions for learning and community building are the two evidence-based interventions we will focus on to improve attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Conditions for learning provides all scholars an environment that is student-centered, organized, and set-up for success. Community building builds a culture of teamwork and openness in which all scholars feel comfortable to learn and grow with a "team-like" approach to the environment.

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.

Classroom organization to foster self-sufficiency for scholars to be able to explain what they are learning, why they are learning it, and how they know when they have achieved the learning.

Person Responsible: Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

High Expectations will hold students accountable to their goals and how to progress their learning.

Person Responsible: Julie Brewster (brewsterju@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Student Engagement allows for scholars to feel energized, attentive and inspired to learn.

Person Responsible: Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Each classroom creates an atmosphere where students understand the daily routines in order to achieve success.

Person Responsible: Julie Brewster (brewsterju@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Building a positive learning environment through strong relationships.

Person Responsible: Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Morning meeting is conducted daily to foster a climate of trust, respect, and community.

Person Responsible: Julie Brewster (brewsterju@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**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.

Professional Learning Communities allow leadership and teachers to work together to align instruction to student need, based on data, in a cyclical process.

Measurable Outcome:

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

55% of students will meet proficiency and 65% of students will make a learning gain by ensuring whole group and small group instruction in all content areas is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

3rd graders will increase proficiency from 58% to 68% as measured by the FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Student data, walkthroughs, collaborative planning and PLC session notes

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Austin (austink@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.)

Data-driven PLC and collaborative planning allows teachers to plan standards-based lessons with an emphasis on task alignment to the benchmarks of the grade level and make adjustments throughout the school year based on student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Professional Learning Communities allow leadership and teachers to work together to align instruction to student need in a cyclical process.

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.

Backwards planning with the end in mind by analyzing the benchmarks, taking the end of unit assessment, determine misconceptions, and developing a sequence of lessons that deepen student understanding (PLC - Collaborative Planning)

Person Responsible: Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Direct instruction will be developed within whole and small group planning to teach students strategies, assess understanding, monitor effectiveness, and scaffold as needed.

Person Responsible: Julie Brewster (brewsterju@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Data based PLC cycles will allow teachers to work collectively in reoccurring cycles of improvement by using student data to plan for small group instruction, remediation, and enrichment.

Person Responsible: Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Intervention planning uses a cycle of improvement that analyzes student data to organize small group for targeted instruction (Intervention PLC).

Person Responsible: Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**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.

In order for scholars to become proficient in all content areas, they need to be engaged in and show ownership for their own learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

55% of grade 4/5 students will meet proficiency and 65% of students will make a learning gain by ensuring whole group and small group instruction in all content areas is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

In 3rd grade, we will increase proficiency from 58% to 68% as measured by the PM3 FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Scholar Data chats, data walls, scholars checking grades and attendance bi-weekly

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Brewster (brewsterju@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.)

Evidenced-based instructional strategies and feedback

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidenced-based instructional strategies ensures student-centered learning with the expectation that all students experience success.

Feedback allows the teacher to provide students with an understanding of their achievement level and how to progress further.

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.

- Higher Order Thinking (HOT) questions are used to increase classroom discussion and assess student learning.
- Differentiated Instruction provides students with various avenues to access and demonstrate learning via process, assessment, product, and/or environment.
- By integrating the arts into academic subjects, students can develop a deeper understanding of the content and engage in more creative and meaningful ways.
- Graphic Organizers are used to guide and organize the process of critical thinking.

- e. Cooperative Learning allows scholars to facilitate their own learning and show evidence of understanding.
- f. Small Group provides opportunities to address learning deficits and/or enrich the learning experience.
- g. Exit Slips allow the student to reflect on their own learning and allows teachers to gather data to inform instruction.

Person Responsible: Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

- a. Formative assessment checks allow teachers to actively monitor and track students' learning so adjustments can be made.
- b. Data chats are one-to-one conversations between the teacher and student where the student's strengths and areas for growth are clear and goals and actions steps can be developed and monitored.
- c. Data walls are visual representations of student progress over time.

Person Responsible: Julie Brewster (brewsterju@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on FAST progress monitoring cycle 3 data, some African American students are scoring lower than the state and subgroups at the school level in both ELA and math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Black students' proficiency in ELA/Math/Science will increase 10%, as measured by FAST and SSA.

Monitoring:

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

School based instructional leadership team (Principal, Assistant Principal and MTSS coach) will monitor data through the use of a grade and content level excel document to include common assessments, formative and summative assessments, attendance, social/emotional learning and subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Austin (austink@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 and staff will provide a safe and equitable learning environment in which African American students build a growth mindset and increase perseverance to achieve academic, behavioral, and social/emotional success. In order to reduce the disparity within our black subgroup's data in attendance, discipline, and academics, professional development is necessary for ALL adults on our campus. The professional development should be on increasing the student engagement of our black students through the use of culturally responsive teaching practices, an equitable mindset, and the setting of high expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy will bring awareness to the cultural needs of African American students by keeping them engaged during instruction, connected throughout the school community, and increase their proficiency in all subject areas. Systematic instruction to include break lessons into sequential and manageable steps that increase in difficulty level.

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.

Monitor the use of appropriate practices and scaffolding to ensure students' needs are met.
Providing teachers with current high leverage practices.

Person Responsible: Julie Brewster (brewsterju@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

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

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

Strategically focus on fully implementing the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative by focusing on VKP-2 classrooms ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

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

Strategically focus on interventions that meet the needs of our 3 - 5 students in foundational literacy standards in order to close gaps so they may become proficient readers at grade level.

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

We will increase the percent of scholars proficient by 10 percentage points as measured by PM3 data.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

We will increase the percent of scholars proficient by 10 percentage points as measured by PM3 data.

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.

We use a tracking tool in which we track the foundational standards by phonemic awareness level, phonics level (decoding and encoding), sight word level, and reading level. Based on this data, students are strategically placed in small groups to have their gaps met and we move them to proficiency. We monitor improvement every 6 - 8 weeks and readjust groups based on new data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Austin, Kelly, austink@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?

- o Provides print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction
- o Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words
- o Reinforce the effectiveness of instruction in alphabets, fluency, and vocabulary
- o Provide instruction in broad oral language skills
- o Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies
- o Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension

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.

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
School Literacy Leadership Teams are meeting regularly to look at data to make informed decisions about what professional learning and supports need to be in place to maximize student growth in reading.	Austin, Kelly, austink@pcsb.org
Literacy coaches work with school principals to plan and implement consistent professional learning outlined by the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative around evidence-based practices grounded in the science of reading as well as the UFLC Flamingo Small group model to demonstrate a significant effect on improving student outcomes.	Austin, Kelly, austink@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.

We provide all documents via our website, Facebook, and at our school lobby. In addition, we share the documents at our annual Title One Meetings and our PTO/SAC events. The documents are provided in the two other languages for our ESOL parents at our school lobby. The school website is <https://www.pcsb.org/sandylane-es>.

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))

The school website is <https://www.pcsb.org/sandylane-es>.

We have a plan in which families are invited to a minimum of quarterly school-wide events where they celebrate the Arts within our school and learn about ways to support their children. The focus of these events include: ELA, Math, Science/STEM, and student data.

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)

We have developed an Instructional Playbook which builds on our school-wide common language of expectations that align to our SIP. The five categories include: conditions for learning, community, collaborative planning, instructional strategies and feedback. All of these categories can be found in our Plan for Improvement Section 3 of the SIP.

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))

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

We have a full-time psychologist, social worker, and school counselor who work as a team with the administration to identify scholars who need more mental health and mentoring services. We provide school employee mentors if scholars need it for academic purposes, but we also offer community mentors to support our scholars as advocates. Our social services team all provide 1:1 and/or small group support based on scholar need. We also have a Suncoast counselor that provides mental health counseling to many of our scholars through their Medicaid services. We have a Family Navigator that also works with several of our families on jobs, housing, food, and parenting courses.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

NA

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We have a comprehensive PBIS plan. Staff, scholars, and their families are all trained on our PBIS processes. We also have a behavior team that addressed behavioral issues and we use data to define which scholars who may need Tier 2 or Tier 3 services, in which case, we use the MTSS process. This team uses a problem-solving worksheet as needed based on data (meet monthly).

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

We have weekly PLCs for grade level teams that follow a cyclical process that uses student data to problem solve, develop an action plan, monitor and assess for results. The data used ranges from formative assessments to summative assessments. Weekly staff meetings are used to provide professional development that aligns to our school improvement plan that centers around our 5 core focus areas: Conditions for Learning, Community Building, Content Planning, Instructional Practices, Assessment and Feedback. We have a primary literacy coach, intermediate literacy coach, math coach, and science coach that collaboratively plan with our teachers and do coaching cycles to support our teachers.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement					\$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
			3871 - Sandy Lane Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	300.0	\$1,500.00	
			Notes: These funds will be used to pay a stipend to the SIP Committee chairs who oversee the strategies and action steps of the SIP.				
			3871 - Sandy Lane Elementary School			\$0.00	
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American					\$0.00
Total:						\$1,500.00	

Budget Approval

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

Yes