

Pinellas County Schools

# Tarpon Springs Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

# Tarpon Springs Elementary School

555 PINE ST, Tarpon Springs, FL 34689

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Art Steullet**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/20/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	<b>Black/African American Students</b> Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (58%) 2020-21: (61%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (44%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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.**

Mission: To promote highest student achievement in a safe learning environment.

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

Vision: 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
Steullet, Art	Principal	Manage all school operations, including recommending and supervising all staff, maintaining a safe learning environment, managing all budgets and funding, assuring fidelity of implementation of all processes and procedures.
Saccasyn, Thea	Assistant Principal	Assists principal in managing all school operations, including recommending and supervising all staff, maintaining a safe learning environment, managing all budgets and funding, assuring fidelity of implementation of all processes and procedures; manages school attendance and achievement data; coordinates testing procedures and processes.
Harper, Tania	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Saaf, Jillian	Teacher, ESE	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 6/20/2022, Art Steullet

**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.*

0

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

39

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

438

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

1

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

2

**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	77	78	82	88	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	436
Attendance below 90 percent	0	25	33	37	27	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	7	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

**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	0	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	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	80	86	80	85	65	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	481
Attendance below 90 percent	0	31	23	29	21	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	33	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	40	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
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	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	80	86	80	85	65	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	481
Attendance below 90 percent	0	31	23	29	21	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	33	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	40	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
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	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	40%			42%			45%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%			64%			58%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%			84%			52%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	53%			57%			55%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	62%			68%			57%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	74%			70%			52%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	55%			42%			27%	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.**

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	41%	56%	-15%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	56%	-2%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
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	75%	64%	11%	64%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	42%	60%	-18%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2022					
	2019	29%	54%	-25%	53%	-24%

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	16	53		39	58						
ELL	37	52		56	52						
BLK	29	58		33	58	64	50				
HSP	40	52		55	62		71				
MUL	57	67		53	62						
WHT	43	52		68	64		44				
FRL	34	52	71	49	58	73	46				
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	32	62		37	60	70	40				
ELL	38	86		61	86		29				
BLK	24	47		35	44		22				
HSP	47	70		58	81		36				
MUL	50			73							
WHT	49	64		74	70		61				
FRL	39	63	88	55	71	75	40				
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	35	56	64	48	77	77	31				
ELL	47	64	63	60	55	55	18				
BLK	27	46	45	41	53	45	8				
HSP	49	58	59	58	57	58	35				
MUL	50	70		50	50						
WHT	57	67	55	64	60	57	44				
FRL	43	56	51	51	56	51	28				

### 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	61

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
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	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	486
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
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
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
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	54
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	58
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?

Our previous state data showed a decline in science scores, although our current year's assessments demonstrate an increase in science achievement. Our students with disabilities are lagging behind in reading and math at most grade levels. Our black ELA scores continue to be below 41 percent.

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

At this time, based on our progress monitoring data, we will focus on our students with disabilities and our black ELA subgroup to assure those students continue to make adequate progress.

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

Contributing factors may include poor attendance, and learning loss due to covid-19 and time spent in an online learning environment. We will address the needs of these students with our specialists staff including our ESE and ESOL teachers, as well as our reading and math interventionists. We will monitor

all progress monitoring data closely and work with the school based leadership team to allocate resources where needed.

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

Our science data has showed the most improvement in comparison to 2019 state assessment data.

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

We assessed students early and worked to fill in gaps from grades 3 and 4 standards. Additionally, we provided extended learning opportunities for students, including lunch time learning labs to fill in gaps based on progress monitoring data. We hosted PLC planning meetings for science, and worked to understand the limit of the standards.

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

We will continue to focus on early assessment to determine student need, and create rich and engaging lessons that will facilitate the closing of any gaps that exist for students.

**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.**

Teachers will be offered professional development on culturally responsive teaching, with a focus on the B.E.S.T. standards to assure teachers are knowledgeable about the standards and able to collaboratively plan rich and engaging lessons.

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

We will utilize the services of our reading and math interventionists, as well as our curriculum specialist and Title I interventionist to assure we are maximizing resources, analyzing data and meeting students' needs in the most effective manner.

**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.**

Continually improving instruction is of high priority.  
 ELA: Our data shows continued growth needed with a current proficiency rate of 40% on the 2021 FSA.  
 Math: Our data shows continued growth needed with a current proficiency rate of 53% on the 2021 FSA  
 Science: Our data shows continued growth needed with a current proficiency rate of 55% on the 2021 FSA

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

ELA: By Spring of 2023, the percentage of students achieving 3 or above on the state assessment, will exceed 62%.  
 Math: By Spring of 2023, the percentage of students achieving 3 or above on the state assessment, will exceed 62%.  
 Science: By Spring of 2023, the percentage of students achieving 3 or above on the state assessment, will exceed 62%.

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

Administrative walkthroughs with observational feedback will be utilized to monitor implementation, and allocate resources to best meet staff needs. Data analysis meetings will be held regularly to review progress. The school based leadership team will action plan and make adjustments and improvements in allocation of resources to best meet students' needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

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

Strategically focus on K-5 teachers and instruction by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, feedback.  
 Science: Develop, implement and monitor a data driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th grade Diagnostic Assessment. Utilize systematic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 3-I science instructional routine and include appropriate grade level utilization of science labs in alignment to the 1-5 grade standards. Support the 5E instructional model through identification and understanding of each component (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate) as identified in each elementary science unit grades 1-5.

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

Daily implementation of rigorous, culturally relevant, standards-based lessons is necessary to assure that learning is maximized. The MTSS coach, Interventionist, Title I, ESE and ESOL personnel will all be utilized to assure that every student is receiving targeted, differentiated instruction based on individual needs.

**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.

Ensure teachers have a clear understand of the K-5 B.E.S.T standards. Schedule dates for all trainings and data analysis meetings focused on instructional improvement during pre-school, monthly curriculum meeting, and weekly PLC's.

**Person Responsible** Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

Increase teacher knowledge of most effective instructional practices and evidence based strategies.

**Person Responsible** Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmarks in the early grades, including targeted instruction and frequently monitoring progress to eliminate gaps early.

**Person Responsible** Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

Provide support and feedback focused on explicit, systematic and sequential approaches to instruction including a gradual release of responsibility model of instruction.

**Person Responsible** Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/ more advanced texts for students above benchmarks. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond, as well as small group instruction based on data.

**Person Responsible** Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

Prioritize increasing volume of reading in grade level text, with discussion and feedback. The most important component of the literacy block is ensuring ample time is given to students to read and write appropriate grade-level text with high quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback. Assure students receive differentiated instruction and individualized feedback and support in math. Assess previous grade level gaps in science and provide instruction to eliminate any existing deficits in knowledge.

**Person Responsible** Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

Collaborative planning will occur by grade level teams and MTSS coach to facilitate the development of rigorous, standards based lesson plans with varied instructional strategies that address assessed gaps.

**Person Responsible** Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

Learning Labs will be scheduled and held to review standards and close gaps with grades 3-5 students

**Person Responsible** Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)



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

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

A gap exists in ELA achievement between white students and African American/ELL/SWD/FRL students. A gap exists in math between white students in African American/SWD students. A gap exists in science between white students and SWD/ELL/African American/Hispanic/FRL students. A focus on improved culturally relevant instruction in all academic areas will enable students in all ESSA subgroups to achieve at higher levels and will ultimately reflect higher performance on state tests.

By spring of 2022, the percentages of African American students in grades 3-5 scoring level 3 or higher on state assessments will meet or exceed 62% in all areas.

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

By spring of 2022, the percentages of English Language Learners in grades 3-5 scoring level 3 or higher on state assessments will meet or exceed 62% in all areas.

By spring of 2022, the percentages of Students with disabilities in grades 3-5 scoring level 3 or higher on state assessments will meet or exceed 62% in all areas.

By spring of 2022, the percentages of students receiving free and reduced lunch in grades 3-5 scoring level 3 or higher on state assessments will meet or exceed 62% in all areas.

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

Administrative walkthroughs with observational feedback will be utilized to monitor implementation, and allocate resources to best meet staff needs. Data analysis meetings will be held regularly to review progress. The school based leadership team will action plan and make adjustments and improvements in allocation of resources to best meet students' needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

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

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

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

Human resource will be maximized to increase rigorous, culturally relevant, standards based instruction to students. By utilizing MTSS coach, Interventionists, hourly teachers and specialists through collaborative and facilitated planning and the use of planbook.com, teachers will increase the quality of lesson plans and increase the quality and quantity of instruction delivered to students.

**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.

Ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the K-5 B.E.S.T standards



**Person Responsible**      Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

Increase teacher knowledge of the science of reading and evidence based, culturally relevant instructional practices.

**Person Responsible**      Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

Provide support and feedback focused on explicit, systematic and sequential approaches to reading instruction including a gradual release of responsibility model of instruction.

**Person Responsible**      Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

Ensure culturally relevant instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional needs. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond, as well as small group instruction based on data.

**Person Responsible**      Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@pcsb.org)

Ensure effective equitable grading practices through professional development, discussion and monitoring so that teachers are keenly aware of each student's progress and can effectively plan for instruction.

**Person Responsible**      Thea Saccasyn (saccasynt@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

Our area of focus is instructional practice in standards aligned instruction. In 2021 our grades 3-5 proficiency was a combined 42%. Additionally, we have 4 ESSA subgroups that did not meet the 41% threshold for proficiency based on 2021 FSA.

In 2021 our grades K-2 proficiency was a combined 46% based on our spring map assessment.

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

In grades 3-5 students scoring a level 3 or above on state assessments will meet or exceed 54%.

**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)**

In grades 3-5 students scoring a level 3 or above on state assessments will meet or exceed 54%.  
In grades K-2 students scoring a level 3 or above on state assessments will meet or exceed 54%.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

In grades 3-5 students scoring a level 3 or above on state assessments will meet or exceed 54%.

**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.

Administrative walkthroughs with observational feedback will be utilized to monitor implementation, and allocate resources to best meet staff needs. Data analysis meetings will be held regularly to review progress. The school based leadership team will action plan and make adjustments and improvements in allocation of resources to best meet students' needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Saccasyn, Thea, [saccasynt@pcsb.org](mailto:saccasynt@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?

Strategically focus on K-5 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, feedback. Additionally, teams will collaboratively plan culturally relevant lessons focusing on

the B.E.S.T standards. Programs will include Jan Richardson guided reading model, Leveled Literacy Intervention Program, and evidence based practices through Project 23.

**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?

Human resource will be maximized to increase rigorous, culturally relevant, standards based instruction to students. By utilizing Interventionists, hourly teachers and specialists through collaborative and facilitated planning and the use of planbook.com, teachers will increase the quality of lesson plans and increase the quality and quantity of instruction delivered to students.

**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
Each grade level will have an ELA champion who will serve in a leadership role as a liaison between the school district ELA department and their grade level team.	Saccasyn, Thea, saccasynt@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.**

The school builds positive relationships with students, families and community stakeholders by

- Implementation of Restorative Practices across campus and embedded into school activities.

- Clubs and organizations for students to promote excellence, such as Little Tutors, Coding Club, STEM clubs and Junior National Honor Society.
- Providing of continuous professional development to staff on equity and excellence for all.
- Providing families with information on Restorative Practices, the school's Guidelines for Success and all school processes that facilitate equity and excellence for all.
- Celebrations with staff to recognize efforts and build a collaborative community.
- Title I events throughout the year inviting families to participate: Open House, Student-led Conference Nights, Books and Bagels Breakfast, Coding and Tech night.
- Monthly newsletters providing updates, information and celebrations.
- Funding of a family and community liaison to grow partnerships with volunteers and community organizations.
- Surveys collect data the School Based Leadership Team shares and utilizes to make school related decisions.

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

SAC: Advocate for students regarding budgeting and legislative issues.

PTA: Advocate for students and staff regarding needs and resources.

Staff: Implement SIP with fidelity and monitor results. Assure equitable education for all.

Families: Support students, assure they are in school daily and work with staff to promote highest student achievement.

Students: Work to support their own progress. Come to school daily, do their work and be good citizens.

Community: Support the school and families with resources needed.