Cross Bayou Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cross Bayou Elementary School

6886 102ND AVE N, Pinellas Park, FL 33782

http://www.crossbayou-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Katherine Wickett B

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2009

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (45%) 2020-21: (37%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click here</u>.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Cross Bayou Elementary will provide a caring and success oriented learning environment that enables each child to become a respectful, responsible and motivated lifetime learner through a collaborative effort among students, staff and the community.

Our School Motto that students can say that supports our school mission is:
C - Care for Others
B - Be Responsible
E - Exhibit Perseverance
S - Show Respect

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success. All students will make a least 1 year of academic growth per year.

School Leadership Team

Membership
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
Wickett, Katherine	Principal		Creates agenda and leads discussions
Stull, Eileen	Assistant Principal		Leads discussions and documents meeting content
Fisher, Carisa	Teacher, K-12		K Team Leader
Brillant, Kristin	Teacher, K-12		1st Grade Team Leader
Fulmer, Meagan	Teacher, K-12		2nd Grade Team Leader
Jones, Lynette	Teacher, K-12		4th Grade Team Leader
Rouse, Stacy	Teacher, K-12		5th Grade Team Leader
Chrosniak, Jessica	Guidance Counselor		School Counselor and Restorative Practice Facilitator
Kuespert, Amy	Teacher, K-12		ESE Team Leader
Scheidt, Michael	Teacher, K-12		Specialists Team Leader
Craig-Langes, Christine	Psychologist		Data Sharing
Johnson, Angela	Teacher, K-12		3rd Grade Team Leader
McClure, Rachel	Instructional Coach		MTSS Coach
Raiola, Cathryn	Teacher, ESE		Equity Lead

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2009, Katherine Wickett B

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

344

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	35	54	52	75	47	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	313
Attendance below 90 percent	1	22	19	36	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	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 who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	15	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/22/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	29	61	54	65	49	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	12	21	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	29	61	54	65	49	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	12	21	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%			34%			38%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%			37%			60%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%			33%			51%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	44%			43%			53%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	53%			48%			50%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%			31%			29%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	48%			32%			39%	53%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	31%	56%	-25%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	48%	56%	-8%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2022					
	2019	33%	54%	-21%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	64%	-1%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	60%	-14%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	29	46		28	38		29				
ELL	22	46		38	54		23				
ASN	63			79							
BLK				6							
HSP	24			35							
MUL	50			30							
WHT	37	36	30	47	53		39				
FRL	27	28	27	37	36	25	18				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	19	24	17	31	31	36	7				
ELL	36	74		64	32		18				
ASN	57	73		81	45						
BLK	22	30		32	43	30	8				
HSP	26	73	70	37	27		25				
WHT	40	62	50	55	57	35	43				
FRL	28	57	57	46	46	25	31				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Proficiency increased in grades 3-5 in all subjects assessed. Overall ELA proficiency increased from 35% - 39%, Math proficiency increased from 43% - 45% and Science proficiency increased from 32% - 48%. Our African American subgroup also increased in overall proficiency in ELA and Math. ELA proficiency increased from 5% - 33% in ELA and 11% - 13% in Math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

SWD Subgroup had decreases in proficiency in ELA and Math. ELA proficiency decreased from 18% - 15% and Math proficiency decreased from 20% - 15%

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

We had more students qualify for SWD during this school year, but it was later in the school year. These students did not receive the targeted ESE instruction prior to FSA testing. These students will be receiving ESE instruction as well as small group targeted instruction from classroom teacher.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science Proficiency increased from 32% - 48%.
Learning Gains in ELA increased from 37% - 63%.
Learning Gains in Math increased from 48% - 59%.
Learning Gains in ELA for Lowest 25% increased from 33% - 53%.
Learning Gains in Math for Lowest 25% increased from 31% - 45%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Focused work with specific students on their area of need.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Continue to use ELFAC data to guide interventions for students in grades 1-3. Use Kindergarten Readiness Skills Assessments to group students to target their areas of need more effectively. Focus on small group instructional strategies/interventions that are standards based and research-based.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

PD on BEST Standards
PD on specific interventions to accelerate learning

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

PLC's focus on alignment of instructional strategies.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Standards-based data (FSA, SSA, MAP, Walk-through data) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA, Math and Science with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-level standards. Students need to continue to receive Core instruction at the level of the standards, but also receive targeted small group interventions/enrichment based on their individual needs in ELA, Math and Science
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 10 % (from 39% to 49%) as measured by FAST. Proficiency in Math will increase 10% (from 44% to 54%) as measured by FAST. Proficiency in Science will increase 10% (from 48% to 58%) as measured by SSA.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will use state progress monitoring assessments along with district assessments in Fall and Winter to measure our progress toward the goal. We will use classroom assessments to measure attainment of specific standards. Frequent monitoring and ongoing progress monitoring will be done by using the appropriate tool for each grade level in ELA, Math and Science, which will include unit and cycle assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Teachers need to have a strong understanding of the standards they are teaching and need to plan whole group lessons to teach the standard. They also need to determine what academic gaps students have and plan to address those gaps during small group instruction.

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.

Utilize administrator walkthrough tools to provide weekly feedback to individual teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff. Use specific tools for each subject area (ie: MTR for Math Practices, Science walk through tool)

Person Responsible   Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

Use Kindergarten Readiness Assessment to strategically group Kindergarten students to give them targeted instruction.

Person Responsible   Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

Use a planned Walk to Intervention for grades 1-3 during ELA to provided targeted intervention based on students need using data from ELFAC and 3rd grade Core assessment.

Person Responsible   Rachel McClure (mcclurer@pcsb.org)

For students struggling with Science vocabulary, provide small group vocabulary review and mini Science projects to address standards not mastered in previous grades.

Person Responsible   Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

Use data from the Science Diagnostic to identify gaps for our 5th grade students and plan how to address gaps in whole group or small group. Share data with 3-4 grade teachers so they can continue to increase their teaching of their grade level content that will promote retention of the concepts.

Person Responsible   Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

Employ instructional practices that result in students doing the work of the lesson: asking higher order questioning, quick demonstration followed by practice, limiting teacher talk, high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback.

Person Responsible   Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

Strengthen student inquiry skills through the implementation and monitoring of the 5 E science routine: use of high-level thinking through questioning, class discussions, problem solving activities and/or collaborative study group.

Person Responsible   Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

Departmentalize in grade 3-5 to be able to have teachers focus on content in either ELA or Math Science.

Person Responsible   Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

Purposefully combine standards and benchmarks to support learning so that a benchmark is spotlighted and supporting benchmarks (such as ELA Expectations/MTR's) that enhance instruction are incorporated in the lesson to meet the demands of the spotlighted benchmark.

Person Responsible   Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Less than 41% of our African American students showed proficiency in ELA (33%) and in Math (13%).
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increase ELA proficiency for our African American Students from 33% to 41% as measured by FAST. Increase Math proficiency for our African American Students from 13% to 41% as measured by FAST.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will use state progress monitoring assessments along with district assessments in Fall and Winter to measure our progress toward the goal. We will use classroom assessments to measure attainment of specific standards. Frequent monitoring and using ongoing progress monitoring will be done by using the appropriate tool for each grade level in ELA, Math and Science, which will include unit and cycle assessments. Students who are not proficient in reading and/or in grades 3-5 will have weekly monitoring by their classroom teacher, ESE teacher or Hourly teacher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rachel McClure (mcclurer@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will consistently implement highly engaging strategies that reach a diverse group of learners and interventions targeted to student need.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the	Our African American Students do not always connect to the instruction and teachers need to use the strengths each student has to help them connect.

**resources/
criteria used for
selecting this
strategy.**

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.

Utilize students strengths when planning for instruction.
Specifically identify the 6 M strategy being used for each lesson in lesson plans (mouth, movement, model, music, meaning, monitoring)
Monitor academic growth of students weekly.
Teachers will set academic growth goals with their African American students and will review these goals with students each month.
Students will received specific interventions based on their academic needs.
Students will be prioritized for ELP programs (ie: Promise Time tutoring, STEM)
Students in grades 1-5 will be assigned a PCS connects device to access District programs at school and at home.

**Person
Responsible**   Rachel McClure (mcclurer@pcsb.org)

#3. 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 critical need from the data reviewed.	Less than 41% of our Students with Disabilities (SWD) showed proficiency in ELA (15%) and in Math (15%).
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increase ELA proficiency for our SWD from 15% to 41% as measured by FAST. Increase Math proficiency for our SWD from 15% to 41% as measured by FAST.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will use state progress monitoring assessments along with district assessments in Fall and Winter to measure our progress toward the goal. We will use classroom assessments to measure attainment of specific standards. Frequent monitoring and ongoing progress monitoring will be done by using the appropriate tool for each grade level in ELA, Math and Science, which will include unit and cycle assessments. Students who are not proficient in reading and/or in grades 3-5 will have weekly monitoring by their ESE teacher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	SWD will benefit from Inclusionary ESE support as they tackle grade level material.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria	SWD need scaffolded support in general education classes for cognitively complex tasks. This can be achieved by using inclusionary practices.

**used for selecting
this strategy.**

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.

Use ESE inclusion model in grades 4 & 5.
Provide time for ESE teachers and Gen Ed teachers to collaborate.
Monitor SWD progress weekly and adjust instruction as needed to meet academic needs.
Walk-to-intervention model will be used in primary grades to target intervention instruction and interventions for SWD will focus on IEP goals.

**Person
Responsible**   Katherine Wickett (wickettk@pcsb.org)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our current rate of attendance for the 21/22 school year is 90.7%. Our goal is to have an attendance rate of 95% or higher.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percentage of students absent for 10% or more of the year will decrease from 36% to 20% or less as evidenced by School Profiles.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will monitor attendance on a weekly basis.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eileen Stull (stulle@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Using the PBIS framework to recognize students and classes with on-time attendance
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	In the past 7 years our percentage of students missing 10% or more of school has increased from 17% to 36%. This has a negative impact on learning We have incentives for students and classrooms to increase on-time attendance.

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

Monitor student absences through the Child Study Team and make personal phone calls to parents regarding their student's absence.
Weekly drawing of students who were in attendance the entire week.
Pro-actively contacting parents of students who had attendance concerns for the 21/22 school year to see how we can assist them and let them know we are still monitoring attendance.
Have reminder signs out at car circle.
Enforce a policy or no early release of students the last 30 minutes of the day.
Small group counseling for students with attendance concerns to try to assist student and families.
Start Battle of the Classes where 4 classes compete each week for the "Bobcat Belt".
Incorporate incentives for parents to get thier students to school on time.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

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

Standards-based data (ELFAC, MAP, Walk-through data) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA in grades K-2 specifically with phonics. Students need to continue to receive Core instruction at the level of the standards, but also receive targeted small group interventions/enrichment based on their individual needs in ELA

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

Standards-based data (FSA, SSA, MAP, Walk-through data) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA in grades 3-5 with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-level standards. Students need to continue to receive Core instruction at the level of the standards, but also receive targeted small group interventions/enrichment based on their individual needs in ELA

The FSA results showed that 73% of our 3rd grade students scored below a Level 3.
The FSA results showed that 62% or our 4th graders scored below a Level 3.
The FSA results showed that 52% or our 5th graders scored below a Level 3.

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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)

Each grade K-2, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

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

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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

We will use state progress monitoring assessments along with district assessments in Fall and Winter to measure our progress toward the goal. We will use classroom assessments to measure attainment of specific standards. Frequent monitoring and ongoing progress monitoring will be done by using the appropriate tool for each grade level in ELA which will include unit and cycle assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Stull, Eileen, stulle@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
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?

Strategically focus 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, feedback, etc.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Use of instructional Coaches help our K-2 teachers receive side-by-side coaching and immediate feedback on how to meet the needs of their students. Ensure teachers understand the BEST Standards increases their planning for instruction.

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
Ensure teachers have a clear understanding of K-2 BEST ELA Standards.	Stull, Eileen, stulle@pcsb.org
Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark in the early grades, including targeted instruction and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.	Stull, Eileen, stulle@pcsb.org
Engage in ongoing PD on the implementation of the high-quality curricular materials, including norming walks for excellence, studying student responses, and robust & constructive feedback.	Stull, Eileen, stulle@pcsb.org

Positive Culture & Environment
A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We have School-wide Expectations posted throughout the school, with specific expectations for each common area. We start the year with an Assembly to share our Core Values with all students and discuss their role in promoting positive school culture. During the year we highlight our Core Values on the morning news show each day and give examples of how to exhibit these qualities inside and outside of the classroom. Our Equity/Restorative Practices team is working with teachers to make sure that staff knows how to handle situations and to be able to effectively welcome students back into their classroom if they have had to spend time out of the classroom. We are implementing Class Dojo schoolwide as a way to consistently track positive behaviors. Each month students can earn a school-wide reward. Students have input into the school-wide incentive rewards. Classroom teachers may determine how they will use the Dojo points as incentives in their own classrooms
We hold a monthly Assembly to recognize a Bobcat of the Month from each class (exhibiting our Core Values) and well as Academic successes. Parents are invited to these Assemblies.

We are implementing more ways to recognize staff including recognizing staff member of the month at our Bobcat Assemblies. We will also recognized staff with weekly shouts outs/weekly staff email and at our monthly staff meeting.

We will have a Book Study on the book, Better than Carrots or Sticks which will promote the use of Restorative Practices Strategies and Equity.

Students are provided opportunities for leadership roles in student groups, including PMAC, Happy Hands signing group and Bayou Crew (patrols/news crew)

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Students have an opportunity to give input into what the monthly school-wide incentive will be. Staff teaches students the Core Values and reinforces when students exhibit positive behaviors.

Staff will lead our Book Study.

Community Partners include:
EVOLution - sponsoring our Family Gathering
Rotary Club of Pinellas Park - recognizing teachers with drawings for classroom funds and grants that have been funded for our school for new benches and picnic tables.

Teachers and Administrators will be using Class Dojo as a way to positively connect with families.