
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	12
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mount Vernon Elementary School

4629 13TH AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33713

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

Demographics

Principal: Robert Ovalle A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 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
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)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2021-22: D (38%) 2020-21: (34%) 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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.

100% Student Success!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Where every student will make a learning gain towards proficiency.

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
Jones, Julie	Assistant Principal	The instructional improvement of students and daily operation of the school.
Ovalle, Robert	Principal	The instructional improvement of students and daily operation of the school.
Toledo, Heather	Reading Coach	
Trotter, Angela	Attendance/Social Work	To improve student performance by decreasing absenteeism and supporting the emotional well-being of students, families, and staff.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Robert Ovalle A

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

339

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

5

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

7

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	41	53	54	44	38	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	279
Attendance below 90 percent	2	16	18	18	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	1	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	5	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/11/2022

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	38	55	43	42	51	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	266
Attendance below 90 percent	1	20	14	9	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	
	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	1	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	38	55	43	42	51	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	266
Attendance below 90 percent	1	20	14	9	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	
	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	1	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	45%			38%			46%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	47%			36%			47%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						33%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	31%			34%			52%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	36%			25%			56%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	22%						39%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	34%			39%			45%	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	37%	56%	-19%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	56%	56%	0%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2022					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

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	45%	62%	-17%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	64%	-4%	64%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	60%	-14%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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
SWD	22	44		9	41	30					
BLK	28	24		8	29	30	8				
HSP	33	55		44	25						
MUL	45			55							
WHT	67	57		41	44		55				
FRL	37	38	58	29	33	23	20				
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	12			12							
BLK	19	17		9							
HSP	39			29							
MUL	45			55							
WHT	51	50		49	38		61				
FRL	33	30		27	19		41				
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	15	30	24	20	33	28	18				
BLK	21	36	31	30	52	53	20				
HSP	57	50		54	56		45				
MUL	63	58		69	58						
WHT	61	50		64	52	30	71				
FRL	42	42	35	46	52	40	42				

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	268
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	21
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	53
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	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

We had a positive trend in the area of ELA and Hispanic student achievement. Our Hispanic ESSA is the highest subgroup and is only 2% percentage points from meeting federal goals.

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

The area of greatest need is Math. We had a 16% decrease in proficiency and our ESSA subgroups in African American, Hispanic and SWD were below the 41% threshold.

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

The most pressing factors were two teachers that were on maternity leave (intermediate teachers) for half of the school year. The inability to hire a qualified teacher to replace the teacher.

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

Our Hispanic ESSA data.

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

Strong focus on the connection between reading and writing. Also, a concerted effort on Running Records from Kindergarten through Fifth grade.

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

The continuation of our Running Records initiative, our cold writes, and our math fluency plan.

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.

This year we will be receiving more targeted District and State support. Primary teachers will also be receiving PELI training from the University of Florida.

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

The continuation of both District and State support.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on 21-22 school year FSA data, only 44% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA. African American sub group performed at the index of 21%. This is the 3rd consecutive year below 41%. Hispanic sub group performed at 39%. This is 2% below the index needed. Students with Disabilities sub group performed at 29% on Florida Index. This is 12% below expectation.
 Our area of focus is to;
 1. Strengthen core instruction using the BEST standards as well as small group differentiated instruction
 2. Identifying students not meeting grade level benchmarks, providing targeted intervention, and monitoring progress
 3. Systematic planning

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

50% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient on statewide measured assessment.

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

- Regularly occurring walkthroughs during core instruction as well as intervention occurring with fidelity, through the use of targeted instruction.
- Star Early Lit. for VPK, K and 1st
- Star Reading for 2nd
- ELFAC data being collected and used to drive small group instruction, this would be evident and monitored in small group lesson plans.
- Evidence of on-going progress monitoring will be aligned and show continuous growth, based on the targeted intervention.
- Teacher will informally assess running record level monthly, this will be monitored through the MTSS data collection.
- A monthly scheduled move up ceremony for each classroom to celebrate improvement in running records will occur.
- weekly leadership meeting to discuss trends in look for documents aligned to SIP
- unit assessments and a ticket out the door

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Toledo (toledoh@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Differentiation in core instruction to include cultural competence as well as small group instruction with targeted intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used

If differentiation occurs during core instruction and includes evidence from cultural competence classroom strategies then students will have entry points into the benchmark instruction. If small group instruction takes place, teachers will identify students and their interventions needed which will then close the gap and make progress toward proficiency in their grade level.

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.

Monthly professional developments based on the differentiation with a focus on cultural competence, the science of reading, and targeted small group instruction.

Person Responsible Heather Toledo (toledoh@pcsb.org)

Walkthroughs monitoring small group instruction and effectiveness in classrooms

Person Responsible Heather Toledo (toledoh@pcsb.org)

Monitoring small group instruction lesson plans

Person Responsible Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

Provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the B.E.S.T. standards/benchmarks.

Person Responsible Heather Toledo (toledoh@pcsb.org)

Calendar out designated collaborative planning sessions as part of the additional 45 minutes per week for planning with action steps needed by colleagues to ensure best standards are utilized and understood and transferred to instruction with a lens on Differentiated Instruction and benchmark-aligned tasks.

Person Responsible Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

PLC reflection forms will reflect an area for disaggregated data

Person Responsible Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on 21-22 school year FSA data, only 32% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in Math. Our area of focus is to;

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

1. Strengthen core instruction using the BEST standards as well as small group differentiated instruction
2. Identifying students not meeting grade level benchmarks, providing targeted intervention, and monitoring progress
3. Systematic planning.....with protocol template

Measurable Outcome:

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

50% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient on statewide measured assessment.

Monitoring:

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

- Students K-2 will be monitored through Star Math Primary utilizing.
- Dreambox will be used monthly to progress monitor all with a focus on Tier 2 and Tier 3.
- Students 3-5 will be monitored through Cambia
- tasks aligned to benchmarks
- unit assessments and a ticket out the door
- weekly leadership meetings to discuss trends on look fors during walkthroughs
- Regularly occurring walkthroughs during core instruction as well as intervention occurring with fidelity, through the use of targeted instruction.
- Evidence of on-going progress monitoring will be aligned and show continuous growth, based on the targeted intervention.
- weekly leadership meeting to discuss trends in look for documents aligned to SIP

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Create a strong alignment between new BEST standards, target and task. Have a focus on implementing tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We believe this problem/gap occurred because a lack of precise professional development and collaboration among colleagues and a misalignment of the standards and tasks. With a focus on the tasks students are asked to do through reasoning and problem solving, it will include thorough planning and planning with the end in mind.

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.

Teachers and administrators will engage in Just-in-Time and district wide Content PD to support implementation of the B.E.S.T. standards and other instructional initiatives to ensure current standards and curriculum materials are understood and utilized.

Person Responsible

Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

Ensure feedback, professional development, and PLC's support the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards and promote strong alignment between standard, target and task on a quarterly basis.

Person Responsible Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

Implement a plan (August 22) based on spring FSA 22 and unit assessments for identifying students not meeting benchmark in all grades, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early. Data chats will occur quarterly at PLCs.

Person Responsible Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

Leadership will conduct weekly meetings to discuss trends from walk throughs utilizing the look for document that includes the evidence planned strategy and other key components of mathematics instruction

Person Responsible Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Increasing positive reinforcements

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Reviewing teacher/student interactions, referral and out of school suspension data per our population we had a disproportional number of referrals for total school population with a specific lenses on African Americans.

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

To improve overall school culture by increasing positive student/teacher relationships, reducing referrals by 50% through the use of positive reinforcement and zones of regulations.

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

Through student/teacher survey, continuous monitoring of discipline data and fidelity of zones implementation on a quarterly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Toledo (toledoh@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

PBIS Rewards System
 Zones of Regulation

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The Zones of Regulation is a metacognitive framework for regulation and treatment approach that is based on immense evidence in the fields of autism, attention deficit disorders (ADD/HD), and social-emotional theories. It integrates best practices around Trauma Informed Care and mental health supports and aligns with the CASEL SEL core competencies.

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.

Complete teacher/student surveys every grading period

Person Responsible Angela Trotter (trottera@pcsb.org)

Review discipline data monthly and share with staff

Person Responsible Jennifer Peers (peersj@pcsb.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our science data had a decrease in proficiency compared to the previous year.

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

50% of students in grades 5 will be proficient on statewide measured assessment.

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

- Regularly occurring walkthroughs of intervention occurring with fidelity, through the use of targeted instruction.
- Look for documents for walk thrus will include science evidence-based strategy
- weekly leadership meetings to discuss trends from look thru document
- unit assessments
- science diagnostic

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Utilize science curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The use of district curriculum in grades K-5 to support the academic progress for science 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.

Make strategic decisions about the implementation of the curriculum to maximize impact on student learning, including, but not limited to common planning, materials management, and use of collaborative structures for high-level engagement tasks.

Person Responsible

Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

Engaging in standards articulation (Grades 1-5) starting with NOS and/or Earth Science.

Person Responsible

Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

Ensure grades 1-5 have a deep understanding of the science lab curriculum, materials management, and pacing/scheduling.

Person Responsible

Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

Deliberate planning, with teachers engaging in the work before presenting to students will be beneficial. Planning out questions, formative assessment strategies, and materials management with intention is imperative.

Person Responsible

Julie Jones (jonesjuli@pcsb.org)

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

Gain a deep understand of the B.E.S.T Standards as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes. Kindergarten scholars that are not on track for the level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment is 27%.

First grade scholars that are not on track for the level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment is 38%.

Second grade scholars that are not on track for the level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment is 34%.

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

Gain a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T Standards as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Third grade students that are below level 3 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment is 42%.

Fourth grade students that are below level 3 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment is 52%.

Fifth grade students that are below level 3 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment is 68%.

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)

Last year, 33% of students in grade K-2 scored within the red or orange bands on Spring Reading MAP. Our goal is for 80% of students in grades K-2 to be on track to pass the ELA FAST.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase from 6% (from 44% to 50%), as measured by module assessments, district provided benchmark assessments, formative and summative assessments.

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.

The Instructional Literacy Team will conduct walk throughs of the classrooms and provide timely feedback to the teachers. Data chats will occur in a timely manner in order to make data driven decisions in the classroom. Coaching cycles will occur based on teacher interest and for whom the data shows a need for improvement. Data chats will come from module assessments, district provided benchmark assessments, formative and summative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ovalle, Robert, ovalle@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. Â§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?

Data chats of school wide, district and state assessments in a timely manner.
 Data driven decision making, derived from data chats.
 Lesson study amongst grade level teams.
 Coaching cycles
 Professional Development
 University of Florida Lastinger Flamingo Small Group Model

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?

Based on MAP and FSA data there is a large number of scholars in K-5 that are not proficient in ELA. These practices are researched based and proven to increase proficiency.

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
Provide regular structures for both planning and PLCs, where teachers regularly engage in data/ student work analysis, as well as study, prep, and plan for upcoming lessons through lesson studies that include scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.	Toledo, Heather, toledoh@pcsb.org
Engage in ongoing professional development of the science of reading, and high quality reading instruction through evidence-based practices.	Toledo, Heather, toledoh@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.

Establishing a positive school culture is the key to any successful school. Developing a positive relationship for all stakeholders consisting of staff, students, families, and the community is crucial for the most efficient operation of the school. Engaging staff with purposeful professional development and relevant culture training will allow our school to have a positive culture and environment. Continuing to support teachers with restorative practices, positive behavior interventions and supports, equitable practices, and culturally relevant teaching practices will create a safe learning environment for all students that allows all students to be successful.

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

The entire staff are stakeholders in creating a positive culture and environment. Creating a successful school is not done in isolation but as a collective group. Every staff member plays a role in the culture of the school.