

Pinellas County Schools

Bauder Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	19

Bauder Elementary School

12755 86TH AVE, Seminole, FL 33776

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Preparing all Bauder students for on or above grade level work in middle school and beyond by collaborating as educators and a community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% student success

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Leichman, Jodi	Principal	Performs all key, educational responsibilities, functions, and duties relevant to the position. Meets education and experience requirements, and any other pertinent criteria/certification.
Baker, John	Assistant Principal	Performs all key, educational responsibilities, functions, and duties relevant to the position. Meets education and experience requirements, and any other pertinent criteria/certification.
Jennings, Lynn	School Counselor	Performs all key, educational responsibilities, functions, and duties relevant to the position. Meets education and experience requirements, and any other pertinent criteria/certification.
Bellomo, Nicole	Psychologist	Performs all key, educational responsibilities, functions, and duties relevant to the position. Meets education and experience requirements, and any other pertinent criteria/certification.
Kelsheimer, Cassie	Attendance/Social Work	Performs all key, educational responsibilities, functions, and duties relevant to the position. Meets education and experience requirements, and any other pertinent criteria/certification.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Leadership Team reviews previous year's formative and summative data to determine the needs of the school. The needs of the school drives the goals and action steps of the SIP. Team Leaders provide input at end of the year meetings and staff is surveyed in the Spring for input into the SIP plan for the following year. The SIP is shared with the SAC for input and suggestions along with budget approval.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Leadership Team reviews, on a monthly basis, progress monitoring data, walkthrough data, and anecdotal classroom data to ensure all action steps are implemented. The School Leadership Team identifies the students with academic deficits for intervention and additional support. The SIP is reviewed quarterly and adjustments to action steps are made, if necessary, to ensure we are on target to meet or exceed our goals.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	18%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	29%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	<i>Data will be uploaded when available</i>
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2020-21: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	8	6	7	4	1	0	0	0	26	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	5	7	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	8	0	0	0	14	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	1	2	3	3	0	0	0	10	

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

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	11	7	7	7	8	0	0	0	40	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	5	3	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	8	8	0	0	0	22	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	11	7	7	7	8	0	0	0	40	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	5	3	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	8	8	0	0	0	22	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	78			74			74		
ELA Learning Gains	80			66			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	70			59			71		
Math Achievement*	82			81			79		
Math Learning Gains	77			82			68		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59			74			45		
Science Achievement*	79			77			68		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	525
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	59			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	64			
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	67			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	78	80	70	82	77	59	79					
SWD	48	58		60	69							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	58	65		69	71		58					
MUL	93	80		100	60							
PAC												
WHT	81	81	72	84	79	63	82					
FRL	69	77	69	71	69	42	75					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	74	66	59	81	82	74	77					
SWD	48			73								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	72			83								
MUL	88			94								
PAC												
WHT	74	65	63	81	81	72	76					
FRL	60	70	58	71	77	67	59					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	74	68	71	79	68	45	68					
SWD	46	53		64	47							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			45								
HSP	61	75		61	63							
MUL	94	92		78	62							
PAC												
WHT	75	66	67	81	69	46	71					
FRL	63	69	71	64	69	50	55					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

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

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our students in 5th grade saw a significant decrease in proficiency on the FAST assessment for ELA. After analyzing the data, we determined that this was a factor of new standards, new curriculum and a new assessment. Our students in 4th grade also saw a decrease, although not as significant for the same reasons. Our 3rd grade students did show an increase, which was attributed to the fact that the new B.E.S.T. standards were introduced when those students were in 2nd grade.

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

Our 5th grade ELA data showed the greatest decline for proficiency. After analyzing all the data, it was determined that new standards, new curriculum and a new assessment attributed to this decline. Another factor was inconsistent or inadequate interventions during the intervention block on the schedule.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

All data was above the state average. This gap is attributed to the demographics of our school and the parental involvement that we have ensures that our students approach school with more support for students, who are struggling academically.

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

3rd Grade Math showed the greatest improvement with a 5% increase from 21-22 proficiency. Our focus was on ensuring that students were actively engaged in standards-based learning activities with a focus on aligning our tasks with the rigor of the standards.

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

Two areas of concern are our Level 1 ELA students in 4th and 5h and the other concern is our Level 1 Math students in 4th and 5th grade.

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

1. Using formative data to drive instruction daily in ELA and Math.
2. Increased Student Experiences and deepening of student engagement.
3. Engaging students in complex, grade-level content aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark.
4. Align student supports with their identified needs
5. Equity and Excellence for All

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Strategically focusing on using formative data to guide and instruct the decisions for instruction are crucial for students to receive what is needed for mastery of the Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards for ELA and Math as well as the Florida's State Academic Standards for Science.

Using progress monitoring strategies and techniques to guide instructional decisions ensures that we are continuously accelerating student learning of all students. Maximizing student learning and instruction through student accountability partnered with teacher accountability will ensure we are adjusting instruction on a daily basis to ensure students master the standards. Aligning instruction to the benchmark and actively engaging our students will ensure teachers can address the deficits in the moment of learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency in ELA will increase from 74% to 80%, as measured by the PM3 F.A.S.T. assessment. Grade 3 proficiency in ELA will increase from 71% to 80%.

Proficiency in Math will increase from 79% to 85%, as measured by the PM3 F.A.S.T. assessment.

Proficiency in Science for all students will increase from 80% to 85%, as measured by the NGSSA assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly, teachers will be analyzing formative assessments in Professional Learning Communities to make adjustments to their instruction. We will also analyze unit and cycle assessments in order to align our interventions and ensure our students are on target for mastery.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Assessment and Feedback: The purpose of feedback is to help the learner get from where they are to where they need to be. Student assessment is not just important feedback for learners but is even more useful to teachers as they work to examine whether the learning goals were achieved, content was understood and methods were appropriate. Formative assessment checks throughout instruction will provide the teacher information to help evaluate the teaching and learning of content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective teaching uses evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward understanding of the content and to adjust instruction continually in ways that support and extend learning. As teachers utilize formative assessment and provide feedback and remediation helps the learner get from where they are currently to where they need to be. Student assessment is important feedback for teachers to examine whether learning goals were achieved as well as help the teacher evaluate the teaching and learning of content.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers and administrators will use state and district resources to synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

Person Responsible: Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)

Teachers will provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark.

Person Responsible: Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)

Teachers and administrators will implement a plan to purposefully monitor student learning specific to the learning target for progression towards mastery. Remediation will be provided to ameliorate the gaps early in the instructional process.

Person Responsible: Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)

Teachers and administrators will collaboratively plan to ensure there is target and task alignment, as well as analyze the data for patterns and trends to guide instructional decisions.

Person Responsible: Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)

Administrators will ensure teachers receive professional development for Data Monitoring and the use of a systematic process for using the data to drive instruction.

Person Responsible: Jodi Leichman (leichmanj@pcsb.org)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

During the 2022-2023 school year, we had 26 students who were absent more than 10% of the school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student attendance will increase 3% from 96% to 99%. We will decrease the number of students who are absent more than 10% of the school year from 26 to 15 students.

Monitoring:

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

Our Child Study Team will monitor student attendance twice a month to identify students at risk for high absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will connect students who had absences higher than 10% of the 2022-2023 school year with a trust adult for mentoring. Students who are identified as at risk for high absences will also be connected to a trusted adult for check ins and problem solving attendance issues.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Ensuring students have a trusted adult at school will increase the likelihood that students will feel comfortable in attending school. Students who feel welcomed at school and know that their presence or absence is noticed will have positive feelings about school and want to attend.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Child Study team will develop a list of students who had more than 10% absences in the 2022-2023 school year.

Person Responsible: Cassie Kelsheimer (kelsheimerc@pcsb.org)

Child Study Team will survey school staff to identify those wishing to serve as a mentor to the students with high absences.

Person Responsible: Cassie Kelsheimer (kelsheimerc@pcsb.org)

Child Study Team will provide resources for the staff identified as mentors for connecting with students at risk for high absences. CST will monitor that staff is checking in with students and assess impact on attendance each quarter.

Person Responsible: Cassie Kelsheimer (kelsheimerc@pcsb.org)

Students with improved attendance will be celebrated each quarter through incentives and certificates.

Person Responsible: Lynn Jennings (jenningsly@pcsb.org)

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$1,990.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0151 - Bauder Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	498.0	\$1,200.00
			<i>Notes: Funds to provide TDEs to teachers for planning and data review.</i>			
			0151 - Bauder Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	498.0	\$790.00
			<i>Notes: Funds to purchase supplemental materials for instruction and intervention.</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0151 - Bauder Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	498.0	\$500.00
			<i>Notes: These funds will be used to purchase incentives and certificates for celebrating and rewarding attendance.</i>			
Total:						\$2,490.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes