Shore Acres Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Shore Acres Elementary School

1800 62ND AVE NE, St Petersburg, FL 33702

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

Demographics

Principal: Kristen Sulte G

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
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 English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (64%) 2020-21: (45%) 2018-19: A (62%) 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	N/A

* 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.

To provide a rigorous educational program to prepare students to be life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Succeed Achieve Educate
100% Student Success

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	
Sulte, Kristen	Principal		Oversees all aspects of the school
Waechter, Kristin	Assistant Principal		Oversees all aspects of the school
DeCresie, Robyn	Teacher, K-12		SIP Development
Eddings, Lisa	Teacher, K-12		SIP Development
Kiefel, Mariel	Teacher, K-12		SIP Development
Massey, Chelsea	Teacher, K-12		SIP Development
Winner, Christine	Teacher, K-12		SIP Development
Lewis, Barbara	Teacher, K-12		Sip Development
`Armstrong, Kate	Teacher, ESE		SIP Develoment

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Kristen Sulte G

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.*

2

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

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

625

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.

6

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	118	118	125	92	94	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	664
Attendance below 90 percent	0	39	22	22	28	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	8	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	7	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	20	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	5	12	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	2	10	21	13	35	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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 7/6/2022

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	110	93	87	101	81	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	555
Attendance below 90 percent	9	13	9	13	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	7	6	5	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	4	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	11	14	11	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	9	20	12	18	39	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128

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	4	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	110	93	87	101	81	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	555
Attendance below 90 percent	9	13	9	13	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	7	6	5	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	4	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	11	14	11	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	9	20	12	18	39	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128

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	4	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	62%			53%			62%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%			43%			59%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%			25%			57%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	72%			62%			68%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	78%			55%			75%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%			33%			57%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	58%			45%			54%	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	63%	56%	7%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	56%	4%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

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	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	70%	64%	6%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	53%	-2%
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	41	50		46	60		10				
ELL	24			24							
BLK	47	42		42	25		25				
HSP	31	31		46	58		38				
WHT	59	41	31	68	56	50	46				
FRL	39	36	24	51	49	31	27				
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	50	64	50	55	75	60	47				
ELL	20	64		27	50						
BLK	46	46		41	59	44	36				
HSP	39	59		54	56						
MUL	83			67							
WHT	66	58	56	74	82	65	58				
FRL	49	55	60	54	64	50	40				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	522
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	62
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	65
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	
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	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
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	68
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	59
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?

Student Achievement gaps for our black and SWD continue to exist with core instruction. Our subgroups make learning gains but proficiency is not commiserate with white peers. Cohort data continues to remain consistent year after year with no big drop in student achievement. Math data is much stronger than ELA data.

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

Our students' ELA data shows the most need for improvement. Our SWD and Black student data also shows a need for improvement.

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

Lack of foundational reading skills contribute to the lack of achievement. An effort at the K-2 level to utilize District ELFAC data for managing small group skill based reading groups and a look at phonics program and how it is taught whole and small group.

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

Look at district data our Math data continues to improve. Not only core but gains as well.

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

Focused effort on spiraling the standards throughout the year during bell work and math warmup. A focused effort to know basic facts with automaticity was also a contributing factor.

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

Focused efforts on data analysis in ELA and Math to develop small skill groups in both areas, individualized remediation plans and enrichment opportunities. Utilization of Technology Committee on one to one computer initiative for students in grades 1-5.

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.

Technology and small group instruction
ELFAC data analysis and how to use to inform instruction
Guided Reading Structure
Secret Stories Phonics program

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

Reading Intervention teachers
Writing Intervention teacher
Extended Learning before and after school
ELL and ESE teachers during the school day

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 ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	On the 19-20 FSA 52% of third through fifth graders were proficient. Learning gains for all was 44% and 40% for our L25 students. On the 20-21 FSA 58% of students were proficient. Learning gains for all were 60% and for lowest 25% - 45%. All grade levels analyzed district MAP data to determine grade level goal and action step. On the 21-22 FSA 62% of students were proficient. Learning gains for all were 64% and 48% for the lowest 25%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Grade level goals: K- 100% of students will move 4 Running Record levels by the end of the year. 1- 100% of students will move 6 Running Record levels by the end of the year. 2- 100% of students will move 3 Running Record levels by the end of the year. 3- 70% of students will be proficient as measured by the state progress monitoring tool. 4- 75% of students will be proficient as measured by the state progress monitoring tool. 5- 70% of students will be proficient as measured by the state progress monitoring tool.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Running Record, District Formative and State Progressing Monitoring Assessment data will be collected and analyzed during monthly PLC to monitor progress towards desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Using problem solving process each grade level identified an evidenced based strategy aligned to their data and agreed upon barrier. The specific strategies are listed as action steps below.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Grade levels analyzed district and state assessments to determine 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.

Kindergarten- Utilize Secret Stories Phonics Program in whole and small group instruction. Utilize ELFAC data to identify students not meeting benchmarks and grouping for target instruction.

Person Responsible   Robyn DeCresie (decresier@pcsb.org)

First- Utilize Secret Stories Phonics Program in whole and small group instruction. Utilize ELFAC data to identify students not meeting benchmarks and grouping for target instruction.

Person Responsible   Mariel Kiefel (kiefelm@pcsb.org)

Second- Utilize Secret Stories Phonics Program in whole and small group instruction. Utilize ELFAC data to identify students not meeting benchmarks and grouping for target instruction.

Person Responsible   Lisa Eddings (eddingsl@pcsb.org)

Third- Provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark with an emphasis on utilizing a consistent vocabulary routine along with a focus on asking higher level questioning.

Person Responsible   Christine Winner (winnerc@pcsb.org)

Fourth- Orient to and implement the new materials, understanding how the materials connect to evidence-based practices and B.E.S.T. Standards. with a focus on utilizing a consistent vocabulary routine with students.

Person Responsible   Chelsea Massey (masseyc@pcsb.org)

Fifth-Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmarks, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early with a focus on writing.

Person Responsible   Barbara Lewis (lewisba@pcsb.org)

ESE- ESE teachers will collaborate with intermediate teachers 1 time a month to gain knowledge of the specific standards being taught. ESE teachers will collaborate to plan meaningful lessons that support the core instruction through push in or pull out model.

Person Responsible   Kate `Armstrong (armstrongka@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	On 19-20 FSA 59% of our students were proficient in Math. An analysis of district MAP data shows that in all grade levels 60% or more are proficient. Our Black achievement gap exists in some grade levels and SWD continue to underperform. On the 20-21 FSA 67% of students were proficient. Learning gains for all were 77% and the lowest 25% were 65%. On the 21-22 FSA 72% of students were proficient. Learning gains for all was 78% and 65% for the lowest 25%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Grade Level Goals. The percentage of students meeting Math proficiency on Spring State Progress Monitoring Assessments and on all District Formative Assessments K- 90% 1- 85% 2- 75% 3- 75% 4- 75% 5- 75%
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	District Formative and State Assessment data will be collected and analyzed during monthly PLC to monitor progress towards desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Using problem solving process each grade level identified an evidenced based strategy aligned to their data and agreed upon barrier. The specific strategies are listed as action steps below.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Grade levels analyzed district and state assessments to determine 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.

Kindergarten- Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early with a focus on small group instruction and skill groups.

Person Responsible   Robyn DeCresie (decresier@pcsb.org)

First- Utilize multiple forms of formative assessment and use the District Data PLC Protocol to game plan to utilize differentiated resources to inform future instruction with emphasis on planning center activities and math warm up focusing on spiraling standards.

Person Responsible   Mariel Kiefel (kiefelm@pcsb.org)

Second- Teachers engage in Just-in-Time Content PD to support Implementation of the B.E.S.T. Standards and other instructional initiatives to synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

Person Responsible   Lisa Eddings (eddingsl@pcsb.org)

Third- Employ instructional practices and routines that promote student-centered learning with a focus on Pinellas Problem Solving Routine and Reflex Math.

Person Responsible   Christine Winner (winnerc@pcsb.org)

Fourth- Teachers engage in Just-in-Time Content PD to support Implementation of the B.E.S.T. Standards and other instructional initiatives to synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

Person Responsible   Chelsea Massey (masseyc@pcsb.org)

Fifth- Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily using FL Reveal Math and Reflex Math.

Person Responsible   Barbara Lewis (lewisba@pcsb.org)

ESE- ESE teachers will collaborate with intermediate teachers 1 time a month to gain knowledge of the specific standards being taught. ESE teachers will collaborate to plan meaningful lessons that support the core instruction through push in or pull out model.

Person Responsible   Kate `Armstrong (armstrongka@pcsb.org)

#3. 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.	On the 2019-20 SSA 45% of students were proficient. On the 20-21 SSA 52% of students were proficient. The problem/gap exists because there is a need to continue to develop high yield strategies in all grade levels through observation and feedback. On the 21-22 SSA 58% of students were proficient.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percentage of students meeting proficiency will be 65% as measured by SSA.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Progress Monitoring using district formative assessments will be done and analyzed during PLC towards desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristen Sulte (sultek@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.	By focusing efforts on development of staff and best practices student achievement will increase.

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 tool to provide weekly feedback to individual teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices (Use of High order questioning, quick demonstration followed by practice, limited teacher talk, high- quality feedback and opportunities to use feedback) in science that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff.

Person Responsible	Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Behavior	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Feedback from stakeholders on 21-22 PBIS plan showed that students were somewhat connected to the group reward system. There were 10 referrals written for 9 students for the 21-22 school year. Our Black Risk Ratio is 44%.. Black students make up 13% of the school population but count for 50% of referrals written. There is a need to decrease this. Survey data did show that a way to reward individuals may have a positive impact on student behavior.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The black risk ratio for referrals will be cut in half to 22% as measured by referral data. Survey data will show 100% understanding and participation in the PBIS reward system.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Members of the PBIS Team will meet monthly to review referral and call out data as well as data on how students are doing with individual reward system.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Creating and implementing individual reward system connected to the Guidelines for Success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	With the addition of individual reward program we hope to keep students connected to the program and decrease level 1 behaviors which would warrant a referral.

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.

PBIS team will develop an individual reward system with all stakeholder input for implementation.

Person Responsible   Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org)

PBIS team will conduct three faculty meetings during the school year with focus on PBIS, Restorative Practices and Culturally Relevant Teaching Strategies.

Person Responsible   Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org)

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Black Student Achievement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	On the 22-23 ELA FSA 46% of our Black students were proficient, 57% made gains and 40% of the lowest 25% made gains. There is a need to ensure that each teacher plans and delivers lessons that meet the needs of our Black students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	70% of our Black students will be proficient as measured by the state progress monitoring tool.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	District formative assessments will be tracked and analyzed towards student proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Ensure that instructional supports are in place for our Black student during core instruction and independence as well as extensions and more advanced texts for students above the benchmark. These supports include access to grade level text as well as small group instruction based on data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Immersing students in grade level text with supports will help to build stamina and allow students to practice skills independently

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.

At weekly Collaborative Planning teams will look plan to meet the needs of Black learners by identifying culturally relevant teaching strategies to use in lessons as supports for learners.
At monthly PLC all grade levels will disaggregate and analyze data of our Black students and create action plans to remediate missed standards in small group. Data will be monitored monthly. Administrative walkthroughs during ELA block to monitor Black student immersed in text or working within a small group on specific deficits.

Person Responsible   Kristen Sulte (sultek@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 understanding of the BEST standards as a non-negotiable to improving student outcomes.
Kindergarten students performing in the red and orange bands on Spring MAP was 13%.
First grade students performing in the red and orange bands on Spring MAP was 15%.
Second grade students performing in the red and orange bands on Spring MAP was 28%.

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

Gain a deep understanding of the BEST standards as a non-negotiable to improving student outcomes.
Third grade students that are below statewide ELA assessments is 21%.
Fourth grade students that are below statewide ELA assessments is 42%
Fifth grade students that are below statewide ELA assessments is 53%
Overall 39% of students were below on statewide ELA assessments.

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, 19% of our K-2 students scored within the red and orange bands on Spring Reading MAP. Our goal is to have 85% of K-2 students on track to pass the ELA FAST.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Proficiency in ELA will increase 10% in grades 3-5 as measured by all district and state 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.

Data from district formative assessments will be analyzed and action plans implemented at all grade levels to remediate standards. Identified students needing more intensive remediation will be placed in our Extended Learning program during the school day. Students will be progressed monitored by weekly and data reviewed and analyzed by SBLT.

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

Sulte, Kristen, sultek@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?

Data Chats of district and state assessments
Action planning to determine small group remediation groups
Professional development on small group strategies

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 data there are still students no 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
Implement the instructional materials, understanding how the materials connect to evidence based practices and BEST Standards.	Sulte, Kristen, sultek@pcsb.org
Provide regular structures for planning/PLC where teachers engage in data/student work analysis to provide scaffolds for student learning and remediation plans. Utilize ELFAC to determine student deficits and plan accordingly.	Sulte, Kristen, sultek@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.

Shore Acres prides itself on the family atmosphere it has cultivated over the years. The front office staff has been trained in customer relations. There is a very visible PTA who works to engage families in monthly activities at various times. The Family Engagement Team surveys families and works to host Family Nights throughout the year. Teachers communicate with families daily through agenda books, emails or Class Dojo. The monthly newsletter is done in conjunction with the PTA and shares positive happenings around the school. The School Advisory Council provides input and guidance in the writing of the SIP. The PBIS/Equity Team meets monthly to develop professional learning opportunities for all staff with a focus on building classroom culture, relationships and utilizing culturally relevant teaching strategies. Staff and families are surveyed at the end of the year to gather opportunities for growth.
The school also works with feeder preschools to educate families on SAE. Tours for future families are held 12 times a year.

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

Kris Sulte- Principal- Oversees Family Engagement, Team Leaders and SIP action steps.- Focusing on positive family school relationships and running of the school
Kristin Waechter- AP- Oversees our PBIS/Equity Team -focusing on positive behavior intervention and supports, Restorative Practices and culturally relevant teaching strategies
Melanie Every- Guidance- Oversees MTSS to work with families on academic and behavior conerns
Tara Saraceno- Social Worker- Child Study Team - works with families to improve attendance
SAE PTA- Plans Family Engagement Activities and recruits new families to PTA through networking and PTA Facebook