

Pinellas County Schools

Seminole 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	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Seminole Elementary School

10950 74TH AVE N, Seminole, FL 33772

<http://www.seminole-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The faculty and staff of Seminole Elementary unite with parents and community to ensure 100% success by providing a safe and risk-free environment, supporting diverse needs, and making instruction challenging and meaningful for our students while nurturing a passion for lifelong learning.

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
McCafferty, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Cerreta, Louis	Principal	
Grimmett, Ariel	Behavior Specialist	
Lazar Daigle, Lisa	Behavior Specialist	
Malone, Sarah	Psychologist	
Moore, Robin	School Counselor	

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.

Our stakeholders have participated in our SIP development by providing feedback on a variety of surveys including the Title I family survey and the staff needs assessment.

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))

Leadership team will monitor the SIP through use teacher data chats, assessment data analysis, progress monitoring of intervention groups, and the MTSS process.

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	34%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	15	7	7	13	0	0	0	49	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	6	3	1	1	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	17	0	0	0	29	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	11	0	0	0	23	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	10	25	12	13	18	0	0	0	78	

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	10	6	20	26	0	0	0	63

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	1	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	4

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	7	15	7	7	13	12	0	0	0	61	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	3	1	1	3	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	5	2	1	1	3	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	17	15	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	11	21	0	0	0	44	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	25	12	13	18	26	0	0	0	104	

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	16	8	10	27	30	0	0	0	92

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	5	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	4

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	7	15	7	7	13	12	0	0	0	61	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	3	1	1	3	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	5	2	1	1	3	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	17	15	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	11	21	0	0	0	44	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	25	12	13	18	26	0	0	0	104	

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	16	8	10	27	30	0	0	0	92

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	5	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	4

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*	55	55	56	57	54	57
ELA Learning Gains	57	62	61	62	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51	55	52	53	54	53
Math Achievement*	63	62	60	63	61	63
Math Learning Gains	63	65	64	62	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45	54	55	51	48	51

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	46	57	51	60	53	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	69			90		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	449
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	1	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				

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%
BLK	61			
HSP	49			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	56			

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	55	57	51	63	63	45	46					69
SWD	28	38	38	30	44	47	11					
ELL	29	50		57	55							64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	52	63		65	63							
HSP	39	54	64	59	56	20	25					75
MUL	67	70		61	50							
PAC												
WHT	59	56	39	64	67	57	45					
FRL	50	61	58	57	61	55	47					

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	58	46	21	67	45	31	56					50
SWD	27	40		53	53		40					
ELL												50

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			65								
HSP	40			48								50
MUL	86			71								
PAC												
WHT	60	48		70	49		64					
FRL	49	42	20	58	36	31	41					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	57	62	53	63	62	51	60					90
SWD	39	54	45	39	64	61	32					
ELL	30			50								90
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	33		44	73							
HSP	50	48		52	56		50					
MUL	58	74		72	65							
PAC												
WHT	63	66	53	65	60	48	62					
FRL	49	57	58	54	57	51	49					90

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	49%	57%	-8%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	58%	-6%	58%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	53%	12%	50%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	75%	62%	13%	59%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	66%	3%	61%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	61%	-1%	55%	5%

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

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our proficiency level for English Language Arts showed the lowest performance at 55%.

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

ELA showed the greatest decline from the prior year. In the 2021-2022 school year, ELA proficiency at Seminole Elementary was 58%. In the 22-23 school year, ELA proficiency declined 3% to 55%.

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.

Specifically, grade 5 ELA showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state average for ELA grade 5 proficiency was 55%. Seminole Elementary School's grade 5 ELA proficiency was 49%, 6% less than the state average.

Factors that contributed to this gap was less opportunities for differentiated instruction, and student engagement,

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

Science proficiency was 64% for the 22-23 school year. We participated in a school-wide science showcase, the district science showcase, and collaborated with the district science coach to facilitate PLCs based on teacher needs and data.

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

Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C is an area for concern.

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

- Use of differentiated instruction
- Increased experiences and engagement for all students
- Authentic reading opportunities to build stamina
- Use of collaborative structures
- Student ownership via data folders

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student proficiency in all grade levels will be 75% or higher by Progress Monitoring 3.

Monitoring:

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

Administrator walkthroughs, Just in Time District Reading Coach facilitated collaborative planning and Professional Learning Communities, Title I Part-time hourly teacher small groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Explicit and systematic instruction

Scaffolded instruction

Corrective feedback

Differentiated instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Explicit instructional practice for novices in learning new content, skill, or concept: Teachers are more effective when providing explicit guidance with practice and feedback rather than requiring student discovery while learning new skills/concepts.

Teachers can differentiate at least four classroom elements based on student readiness, interest, or learning profile. The most important factor in differentiation that helps students achieve more and feel more engaged in school is being sure that what teachers differentiate is high-quality curriculum and instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Deliver explicit, step-by-step instruction—in multiple, briskly paced cycles. related to student interests & cultural backgrounds using collaborative structures.
- Provide support and feedback focused on explicit, systematic and sequential approaches to reading and writing instruction including a gradual release of responsibility model of instruction.

- Employ instructional practices that result in students doing the work of the lesson which leads to increased experiences and engagement for all students.
- Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement, meaningful tasks related to student interests & cultural backgrounds, opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals by sing data folders, and make their own choices; employ simple procedures (such as proximity) for ensuring that every student is attentive during instruction—with their eyes are on the teacher, ready to learn.
- Use of collaborative structures and authentic reading

Person Responsible: Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going

No description entered

Person Responsible: Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going

#2. 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.

Deepen understanding of the Florida's B.E.S.T ELA, Math, and Science standards and benchmarks as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student proficiency in all grade levels will be 75% or higher by Progress Monitoring 3 or the SSA end of year test.

Monitoring:

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

Administrator walkthroughs, facilitated collaborative planning and Professional Learning Communities, Title I Part-time hourly teacher small groups, Promise Time/ELP.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Identifying critical content

Teacher clarity

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

-Use state and district resources (such as the BEST ELA Standards and PCS Gold Document, Science documents, Math B1G-M) to synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

-Use district PCS Modules curriculum to provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content, knowledge-building, and tasks aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark; and make strategic decisions about implementation of the curriculum to maximize impact on student learning.

-Teachers and administrators engage in Just-in-Time professional development (Module Roll-Outs for Math and ELA, Science Planning Hubs) to engage in backwards planning, deepen understanding of the BEST ELA and Math Benchmarks, the Science Standards, as well as lessons designed to support students as they meet the rigorous demands of the grade-level benchmarks

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.

Professional Learning Communities scheduled and implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)

By When: on-going

Collaborative planning scheduled and implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)

By When: on-going

Schedule Just in Time coaches and provide professional development opportunities for staff based on need.

Person Responsible: Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)

By When: on-going

Literacy Leadership Team strategically implemented and maintained. Collaboration between administrators and LLT to facilitate PLCs and information dissemination to staff in a timely and appropriate manner.

MAST Team strategically implemented and maintained. Collaboration between administrators MAST team to facilitate PLCs and information dissemination to staff in a timely and appropriate manner.

Person Responsible: Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)

By When: Beginning of the year for creation of team. On-going for collaboration.

#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 sustainable, positive school climate fosters student and staff development and learning necessary for a productive, contributing and satisfying life in a society. Students and staff have norms, values and expectations that support people feeling socially, emotionally and physically safe.

Our focus will be to strengthen the Tier two & Three classroom management to ensure positive relationships are built and actively maintained. After receiving a PBIS Reboot, our PBIS committee will lead the staff in PBIS trainings including incorporating morning meetings, implementing character education, Restorative Practices, consistent schoolwide discipline procedures, all with a focus on social-emotional learning. The committee, alongside administration, will work to support the implementation of positive engagement strategies that work to develop social and emotional instructional teaching practices.

Measurable Outcome:

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

75% of staff members will complete the surveys and administrators will utilize the results of the survey to make adjustments to the school's way of work as appropriate.

Tier 2 & 3 behavior students comprise 67% of discipline referrals. Reduce the percent from 67% to 20%

Increase PBIS Benchmark of Quality score from 80 to 90.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitoring by tracking the use of positive reinforcements and office disciplinary referrals.

Monitoring of student PBIP's and implementation with fidelity

Surveys as appropriate throughout the year. Informal and formal check-ins by administrators, Team leader monthly meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Restorative Practices with emphasis on relationship building

De-escalation strategies

Surveys

Team leader monthly collaborative meetings

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

-Surveys provide quantitative and qualitative data on people's opinions and behaviors that can be used to make important decisions.

-Team alignment is essential for administrators and teacher/staff leaders to make strategic decisions and set goals and priorities.

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.

The PBIS committee and Equity Champions will continue offering professional development for staff members throughout the school year to continue to support the conditions for learning.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McCafferty (mccaffertyj@pcsb.org)

By When: Quarterly

Teachers will review and re-teach classroom and schoolwide expectations during their morning meetings on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McCafferty (mccaffertyj@pcsb.org)

By When: First week of school

Update the SIP on a quarterly basis in order to celebrate areas of growth and update strategies in any area of improvement.

Person Responsible: Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)

By When: quarterly

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The proficiency for students with disabilities in grades 3-5 at Seminole Elementary is 16%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with disabilities will meet or exceed their non-disabled peers as measured by the FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Administrator walkthroughs, Just in Time District Coaches facilitated collaborative planning and Professional Learning Communities, Compliance Instructional staff developer.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Flamingo instructional method
Lindamood-Bell instructional method

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Flamingo Literacy equips educators with evidence-based, practical supports and professional development resources to enhance reading instruction; connects school districts to customized professional development, coaching, and instructional supports; and engages students with innovative programs and initiatives that promote reading proficiency. (retrieved from: <https://lastercenter.ufl.edu/work/literacy/>)

Lindamood-Bell is grounded in our evidence-based research on sensory-cognitive instruction. (retrieved from: <https://lindamoodbell.com/research>)

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.

PLCs with compliance ISD

Person Responsible: Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)

By When: monthly

Data chats with Classroom and VE teachers

Person Responsible: Louis Cerreta (cerretal@pcsb.org)

By When: Every 6 weeks

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

School administrators will engage a variety of stakeholders including teacher leaders, school staff, Parent Teacher Association, School Advisory Committee, and community members.

We will share the information related to funding and gather stakeholder input at the annual Title I meeting as well as at PTA and SAC meetings.

We plan to use funding for intervention resources, professional development, building classroom libraries, and part-time hourly salaries.

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 K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by 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 3-5 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

75% or more of our K-2 students will show proficiency by PM3 of the FAST test.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

75% of more of our 3-5 students will show proficiency by PM3 of the FAST test.

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.

Professional learning communities scheduled with district just in time coaches along with other trained members of our school and district to provide PD on topics related to teacher and student growth. These occur on the 1st and 3rd Wednesday of each month.

Collaborative learning communities will also occur on the 2nd and 4th Wednesdays of the month and are an opportunity for teachers to work together to create lessons based on the BEST standards.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Cerreta, Louis, cerretal@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?

? Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are guided by assessment data and are ongoing, engaging, interactive, collaborative, and job-embedded and provide time for teachers to collaborate, research, conduct lesson studies, and plan instruction.

? School-based teams are provided professional learning sessions on the science of reading and evidence-based literacy instruction, materials, and assessment.

? School-based teams provide training to teachers that integrate the six components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language, comprehension, and vocabulary) into an explicit, systematic, and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies.

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 (alphabetics), 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
? Build capacity by identifying teachers, coaches and district staff who can support training in the use of evidence-based curriculum, instruction, and intervention aligned to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.	Cerreta, Louis, cerretal@pcsb.org
? School Literacy Leadership Team plan family reading nights grounded in family friendly evidence-based practices to support the homeschool connection	Cerreta, Louis, cerretal@pcsb.org
? Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are guided by assessment data and are ongoing, engaging, interactive, collaborative, and job-embedded and provide time for teachers to collaborate, research, conduct lesson studies, and plan instruction.	Cerreta, Louis, cerretal@pcsb.org
? School-based teams provide training to teachers that integrate the six components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language, comprehension, and vocabulary) into an explicit, systematic, and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies.	Cerreta, Louis, cerretal@pcsb.org
? School-based teams are provided professional learning sessions on the science of reading and evidence-based literacy instruction, materials, and assessment.	Cerreta, Louis, cerretal@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.

School webpage, School facebook page, monthly newsletter, Front office Title I bulletin board, flyers home, weekend updates.

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))

Student data chats, school webpage (<https://www.pcsb.org/seminole-es>), School Facebook page, bulletin boards, flyers home, weekend updates.

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))

Uninterrupted learning times, extracurricular programs including Enrichment, afterschool tutoring, STEM, Kiwanis Kids, Chorus, Beats club.

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

n/a

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))

Full-time social worker and school counselor work with teachers, students, and administrators to meet student needs as identified by IEPs, PSWs, and other data sources. Schedules are shared and discussed at MTSS Meetings.

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))

Implement a Digital certification program to be after school where students can earn digital certifications they can utilize in postsecondary education.

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).

Seminole Elementary School implements PBIS and character education.

R.I.S.E

Respect/Responsibility

Integrity

Self-control

Empathy

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))

On-going PLCs in ELA, math, science, and PBIS, professional development in those same areas, data chats with teachers. Utilize four Part-time hourly teachers to provide small groups, bilingual assistant to support ELLs.

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))

Ready Set Kindergarten program, reach out to local preschools inviting them for tours, meetings with administration, etc.