# Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings Elem School



**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

# Table of Contents

# Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings Elem

## 6505 68TH ST N, Pinellas Park, FL 33781

### http://www.rawlings-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.**

Educate and prepare each and every student for college, career and life.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Aligned to the Pinellas County Schools District Vision of 100% Student Success, MK Rawlings Elementary's
vision is Always Expect the Best- 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Keiper, Tammy | Principal | |
| Heuman, Angela | Assistant Principal | |
| Oester , Jacqueline | Instructional Coach | |

### 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.


End of 21-22 and on-going 22-23 data was shared with staff and SAC regularly throughout the year to have discussions on areas of focus, strengths and areas for growth. Monthly meetings included discussions on SIP and Title I plans, use of staff and funding. This will continue with 22-23 end of year data and 23-24 on-going data.
As the SIP draft is written, staff and SAC will be meeting to review, revise and put into action or plan. At of Back to School Bash, all families will be asked to review and comment on components of the plan. SIP will then be refined and accepted by staff ad SAC.

### 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))


End of 22-23 and on-going 23-24 data will be shared with staff and SAC regularly throughout the year to have discussions on areas of focus, strengths and areas for growth. Monthly meetings will include discussions on SIP and Title I plans, use of staff and funding. We will continue to review and revise the

plan based on data. Monitoring teams will be set up to focus on individual student growth via weekly standards trackers and review data at SBLT ad PLCs to make decisions for each student as needed.

## Demographic Data

| | |
|---|---|
| **2023-24 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | Other School PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | Yes |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 61% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 100% |
| **Charter School** | No |
| **RAISE School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 ESSA Identification** | TSI |
| **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) | |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C |
| **School Improvement Rating History** | |
| **DJJ Accountability Rating History** | |

## Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 19 | 15 | 10 | 14 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 37 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**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 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 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 | 1 | 23 | 26 | 25 | 22 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

## Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 1 | 23 | 26 | 25 | 22 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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.

**District and State data will be uploaded when available.**

| Accountability Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 38 | | | 40 | | | 43 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56 | | | 48 | | | 52 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 54 | | | 57 | | | 39 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 49 | | | 50 | | | 54 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | 56 | | | 50 | | | 54 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 56 | | | 32 | | | 35 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 40 | | | 50 | | | 43 | | |

| Accountability Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | | | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | | | | |
| ELP Progress | 59 | | | 74 | | | 74 | | |

*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) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 51 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 408 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

## ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 26 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| ELL | 48 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 67 | | | |

| 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 | 37 | Yes | 3 | |
| HSP | 47 | | | |
| MUL | 38 | Yes | 1 | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | | | |
| FRL | 48 | | | |

## 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 | 38 | 56 | 54 | 49 | 56 | 56 | 40 | | | | | 59 |
| SWD | 12 | 42 | | 20 | 30 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 39 | 50 | | 48 | 44 | | | | | | | 59 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 50 | 81 | | 77 | 65 | | | | | | | 64 |
| BLK | 14 | 42 | 60 | 21 | 45 | 62 | 17 | | | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 42 | | 53 | 54 | | 33 | | | | | 53 |
| MUL | 25 | | | 50 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | 62 | 56 | 52 | 59 | 47 | 46 | | | | | |
| FRL | 34 | 49 | 50 | 43 | 55 | 57 | 35 | | | | | 58 |

| 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 | 40 | 48 | 57 | 50 | 50 | 32 | 50 | | | | | 74 |
| SWD | 7 | 25 | | 29 | 23 | | 29 | | | | | |
| ELL | 20 | 47 | | 47 | 60 | | 50 | | | | | 74 |

| 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 | 45 | 60 | | 70 | 87 | | 76 | | | | | 86 |
| BLK | 24 | 41 | | 35 | 35 | | 24 | | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 27 | | 48 | 27 | | 33 | | | | | 75 |
| MUL | 46 | | | 38 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 44 | 53 | | 53 | 46 | | 58 | | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 39 | 57 | 45 | 45 | 33 | 42 | | | | | 79 |

| 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 | 43 | 52 | 39 | 54 | 54 | 35 | 43 | | | | | 74 |
| SWD | 28 | 38 | 25 | 22 | 41 | 36 | 20 | | | | | |
| ELL | 38 | 56 | | 55 | 67 | | 60 | | | | | 74 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 58 | 63 | | 86 | 80 | | 73 | | | | | 86 |
| BLK | 18 | 36 | 28 | 25 | 21 | 16 | 6 | | | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 49 | | 45 | 58 | | 31 | | | | | 61 |
| MUL | 47 | 50 | | 53 | 57 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | 56 | 46 | 59 | 55 | 45 | 50 | | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 47 | 39 | 42 | 45 | 35 | 34 | | | | | 73 |

**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.

**School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.**

# 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.**

Third grade showed the lowest data in both ELA and Math proficiency. At the first cycle of FAST, third grade data was the lowest across grade levels and although growth occurred over the year, proficiency levels remained low.

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

Math proficiency in 3-5 grades combined showed the greatest decline. First cycle of FAST Math scores showed minimal proficiency and growth was made over the year however, not to the level of expected proficiency.

**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.**

Third grade students showed a gap in proficiency. Students came into third grade lacking necessary foundational skills to master third grade BEST standards. More effective scaffolding was need to support students growth.

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

Fifth grade science showed the most gain. We monitored fidelity of science time, had additional push in staff and imbedded science reading into interventions.

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

Attendance is one of the greatest areas of concern with only a school-wide attendance rate of 72.4%. Referral data is another area of concern.

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

Increased proficiency in ELA and Math
Higher rate of growth over the year in ELA and Math
Improved attendance
Decrease in behavior referrals

**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 Early Warning System

**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.

At end of 22-23 school year, we had 146 referrals; 86 (59%) from black students, 29 (20%) from Hispanic students, 22 (15%) from white students and 10 (6%) from students with disabilities.
At the end of 22-23 school year, our attendance rate was 72.4% with 97 students (24%) with high absences, 30 (31%) white students, 31 (32%) Hispanic students, 23 (24%) black students, 12 (12%) students with disabilities and 10 (10%) multiracial students with high absences.
At the end of 22-23 school year, we had 25 (6%) of students with multiple early warning indicators, 55 (13%) of students with failing grades and 78 (19%) students with low test scores.

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

At the end of the school year, we will reduce the referral rate by at least 10%. We will improve the overall school attendance rate to 90% or higher.

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

Referral data will be monitored on-going as well as number of students participating receiving PBIS rewards. Data will be monitored by administrators, PBIS team, teachers and students.
Attendance data will be monitored by CST, teachers and students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Angela Heuman (heumana@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.)

Celebrate students' growth on academic, social and behavioral goals that are set with the students including attendance,

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need to be aware of their data and growth towards BEST standards, attendance rate and positive behavior incentives. Students will be held to high standards in all areas with supports provided as needed. Celebrating students as they grow will continue to motivate them to lessen the number of students with early warning signs.

**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.

Implement goal setting opportunities where students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals related to PBIS, attendance or other student determined focus, monitor their progress and celebrate their success.

**Person Responsible:** Angela Heuman (heumana@pcsb.org)

School-wide lesson plans for Rawlings ROCKS (PBIS) and Commitment to Character will be implemented in all classrooms.

**Person Responsible:** Angela Heuman (heumana@pcsb.org)

Establish meaningful communication with families and develop and implement a parent engagement plan that is supportive of the needs of students based on their data and goals. Provide resources and training to families as needed to help their child reach their goals.

**Person Responsible:** Jacqueline Oester (oesterj@pcsb.org)

## #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

**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 2022 assessment results, 37% of black students scored at or above proficiency in ELA. This was the third year the proficiency rate was below 41%

Based on 2022 assessment results, 38% of multiracial students scored at or above proficiency in ELA. This was the first year the proficiency rate was below 41%.

Based on 2022 assessment results, 26% of students with disabilities were proficient in ELA. This was the third year below 32%.

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

100% of students in all subgroups will make at least one year's growth from Fall to Spring on the ELA and Math FAST.

At least 60% of all subgroups of students (black, multiracial and students with disabilities) will score at or above proficiency on the Spring 2024 FAST assessment in ELA, Math and Science.

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

All students, both individually and collectively in their subgroups, will be monitored throughout the year by their classroom teacher, grade level PLC, MTSS coaches, SBLT and administrators.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tammy Keiper (keipert@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.)

Ensure small group interventions and scaffolding, core lesson differentiation, specially designed instruction (SDI) and UDL are implemented in alignment with evidence-based practices. Utilize strategies obtained from Closing the Gap and AVID.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing instructional strategies that are evidence based to focus on meeting the needs of all students based on data including scaffolding, small groups intervention, specially designed instruction and differentiating within core to increase student achievement for students in all subgroups.

**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.

Develop a professional learning plan that supports the growth of all students to include small group instructional practices, scaffolding, differentiation, SDI and UDL. Incorporate ESE, Closing the Gap and AVID strategies.

**Person Responsible:** Tammy Keiper (keipert@pcsb.org)

Regularly collaborate as a leadership team to engage in meaningful discussions and collective goal-setting around improving student outcomes including strengthening a culture of high expectations for all students.

**Person Responsible:** Tammy Keiper (keipert@pcsb.org)

Provide regular structures for collaborative planning and PLCs where teachers regularly engage in data/student work analysis as well as intellectual prep and lesson rehearsal for upcoming lessons, including scaffolding that address gaps in student learning.

**Person Responsible:** Jacqueline Oester (oesterj@pcsb.org)

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

**Person Responsible:** Angela Heuman (heumana@pcsb.org)

School schedule and servicing plan will focus on a clustering process to meet the needs of students through collaboration with service providers (ESE/ELL/Title I/Coaches/etc.).

**Person Responsible:** Tammy Keiper (keipert@pcsb.org)

## #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.

Based on proficiency data in all content areas, observational feedback and lesson plan review, incorporating high-yield engagement strategies would lead to increased academic achievement. In order to improve our student achievement in ELA, Math and Science we need to continue to focus on aligning instructional practices with standards-based tasks that are differentiated as needed, include UDL principles, and systematically progress-monitored to ensure improved student achievement that is regularly celebrated.

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

100% of student will make at least a year of gains from Fall to Spring on STAR and FAST assessments in ELA and Math.
At least 60% of students will score at proficiency or above in ELA, Math and Science in Spring 2024.
At least 70% of third students will score at proficiency or above in ELA in Spring 2024.

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

Monitoring of progress will start at the student level, followed by teacher, coaches and administration. Data will be reviewed weekly. Monthly and quarterly celebrations will be in place. Based on data and observations, high-yield engagement instructional practices including differentiation and UDL will be monitored and coaching support provides as needed.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Keiper (keipert@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.)

Celebrate students' growth with regards to goal setting and academic progress to encourage the use of high-yield engagement strategies, differentiation and UDL to ensure continuous academic growth.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need to be aware of their data and growth towards mastery of the BEST and FSASS standards. Students will take ownership of their learning and be celebrated along the way to motivate and continue to hold high expectations of all students. An increased focus on positive academic growth and proficiency will be evident through use of high-yield engagement strategies, differentiation and UDL principles.

### 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.

Implement school-wide practices for goal setting where students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals, monitoring their academic progress throughout the year, revising their goals based on data and celebrating success.

**Person Responsible:** Tammy Keiper (keipert@pcsb.org)

Implement student-led conferences to allow students to share their academic goals and their progress with family members.

**Person Responsible:** Angela Heuman (heumana@pcsb.org)

Employ high-yield instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to UDL, differentiation, positive expectations for success, meaningful tasks related to student interests and cultural backgrounds, opportunities for students to ask their own questions set their own goals and make their own choices.

**Person Responsible:** Tammy Keiper (keipert@pcsb.org)

Increase opportunities for writing across the curriculum and to celebrate student writing through participation in school-wide monthly writing and community writing competitions.

**Person Responsible:** Tammy Keiper (keipert@pcsb.org)

Instructional staff will provide immediate and actionable feedback to students during lessons and differentiate instruction based on need to support student growth toward mastery of the standard being taught.

**Person Responsible:** Jacqueline Oester (oesterj@pcsb.org)

Teachers engage in collaborative planning and PLC discussions that focus on data and impact of instructional practices.

**Person Responsible:** Angela Heuman (heumana@pcsb.org)

## 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).

Staff provides suggestions on needs for SIP funds based on data. SAC further reviews the suggestions and potential impact on achievement before approving.

## 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, cycle of coaching, and feedback.

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

Continue to monitor whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block to ensure instruction in both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to researched-based principles and meets the needs of all students. Based on Spring 2023 FAST ELA data, 35% of third grade students, 39% of fourth grade students and 46% of fifth grade students scored at or above proficiency.

**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**

At least 70% of students in grades K-5 will score at proficiency or above on the Spring 2024 ELA STAR.

**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

At least 60% of third grade students will score at proficiency or above based on the ELA Spring 2024 FAST.
At least 60% of fourth grade students will score at proficiency or above based on the ELA Spring 2024 FAST.
At least 60% of fifth grade students will score at proficiency or above based on the ELA Spring 2024 FAST.

## 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.

Monitoring of progress will start at the student level, followed by teacher, coaches and administration. Data will be reviewed weekly at SBLT and monthly by Literacy Leadership Team. Monthly and quarterly celebrations will be in place. Based on data and observation, instructional practices will be implemented and coaching support provided as needed.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Keiper, Tammy, keipert@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 alphabetics, 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

Data chats of school-wide, district and state assessments will occur in a timely manner.
Data-driven decisions will be made based on data chats and PLCs looking at formative assessments and student work.
Professional Development related to BEST standards and ELA best practices will be included on our school PD plan.

**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.

Using data to drive instruction and understand the level of each student provides the opportunity to target the specific areas of needs of each student to ensure instruction will meet the need.

**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 |
| --- | --- |
| Implement a plan for using formative assessments to determine where instruction should be modified to meet individual student needs. This includes small group instruction, scaffolding, differentiating and UDL in core. | Oester , Jacqueline, oesterj@pcsb.org |
| School Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly to look at data and make informed decisions about what PD and supports are needed to be in place to maximize student growth in reading. | Keiper, Tammy, keipert@pcsb.org |
| PLCs and collaborative planning are guided by assessment and are ongoing, engaging, collaborative and interactive to make instructional decisions that will meet the needs of all students. | Heuman, Angela, heumana@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.

A SIP one-page document will be created and physically distributed to all families that is in practical language. It will also be posted on the school-wide Class Dojo site, FB and school website. The SIP is also shared/reviewed in person at the Annual Title I meeting as well as at multiple SAC and PTA meetings throughout the year. A recording of the Title I meeting will also be posted on the website and school Dojo site. https://www.pcsb.org/rawlings-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))

We are starting our year with a Community Resource Fair / Meet the teacher event on a Saturday to allow for more participation. We are using family friendly folders to send home monthly calendars of events. Teachers call parents directly to invite them to events. Student-led conferences will be held at each assessment cycle to show progress towards BEST standards. At all family events, take home materials and suggestions will be provided. https://www.pcsb.org/rawlings-es

**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 II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))**

Utilizing learnings from FLDOE Raise conference, we will ensure Core instruction uses high-yield strategies that incorporate differentiation, scaffolding and UDL to meet the needs of all students. All non-classroom staff will be trained in order to provide push-in support to students as needed. An ELP plan will be created to extend the learning time for students through tutoring and enrichment. All students in grades 3-5 will be encouraged to take home school laptops to continue learning on assigned programs at home.

**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))**

Title I Plan was created to benefit students and our SIP focused on increasing site-based coaching MTSS and Hourly Teachers.