Pinellas County Schools

Belcher Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Belcher Elementary School

2215 LANCASTER DRIVE., Clearwater, FL 33764

http://www.belcher-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.

Believe – Act-Achieve; Believe that all students can learn and Act on those beliefs so that all children can Achieve at their highest level.

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
Lewis, Dawn	Principal	School Leader
Crabb, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader

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 Belcher Elementary School Improvement Plan was established through the collaboration of teachers and administration following the release of the 22-23 school data. As a team, we looked at the progression of learning for all students, subjects, and subgroups over the three assessment windows to decide the necessary goals and action steps necessary to maximize the success of all students.

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 Improvement Plan is a fluid, live document that will allow our instructional staff to analyze the current data trends and plan our instruction based on the specific needs of our students. Our schoolwide progress in reference to the SIP will be assessed following each individual assessment cycle. Our grade level data will be assessed weekly during PLC's, School Based Leadership Meetings and ongoing data chats with teachers, interventionists, and administration. Adjustments and revisions will be made as needed to ensure the goals and action steps are aligned to produce 100%student success.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	51%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
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: B 2020-21: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
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	27	18	25	23	13	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	18	18	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	24	11	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	28	31	26	22	27	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	14	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	21	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	1	5	5	5	0	0	0	18

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	10	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	28	31	26	22	27	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	14	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	21	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	1	5	5	5	0	0	0	18

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	10	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	15
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*	55			55			55		
ELA Learning Gains	62			70			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51			64			50		
Math Achievement*	62			57			62		
Math Learning Gains	65			61			67		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49			26			57		
Science Achievement*	55			66			56		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	65			52			71		

** 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	40	Yes	3	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	90			

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%
BLK	48			
HSP	55			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	53			

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	55	62	51	62	65	49	55					65
SWD	27	50	47	36	57	44	17					
ELL	50	43		59	67		39					65
AMI												
ASN	80			100								
BLK	33	59		46	53							
HSP	56	63		55	65	40	45					61
MUL	67			80								
PAC												
WHT	56	60	48	62	65	59	56					67
FRL	48	64	46	53	58	42	53					60

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	55	70	64	57	61	26	66					52
SWD	26	53		27	64		43					
ELL	46	74	70	48	55		55					52

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
AMI												
ASN	71			93								
BLK	28			38								
HSP	52	78		51	53		42					38
MUL	82			91								
PAC												
WHT	58	71		57	61		74					65
FRL	47	67	59	49	57	27	62					55

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	55	61	50	62	67	57	56					71
SWD	19	29	35	26	51	59	0					58
ELL	34	59	61	50	60	56	24					71
AMI												
ASN	80			90								
BLK	31	52		47	65		45					
HSP	43	62	58	53	55	43	36					69
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	63	62	42	67	72	62	65					80
FRL	49	54	45	53	59	56	48					71

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 ESE population continues to struggle in all areas. The problem/gap is occurring because students were not exposed to curriculum at the level of rigor. Remediation and the amount of Pull-out taking students away from grade level curriculum has been a ongoing struggle .

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

Schoolwide ELA decreased by 4% points. Students are not able to read and articulate grade level text when they are presented with longer passages. Student reading stamina was a great concern.

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.

Bridging the Achievement Gap will continue to be a focus . Our African American students have increased their proficiency but continue to fall below the state average. A stronger emphasis on African American students attending Promise time tutoring and Summer Bridge programs will be offered for acceleration and enrichment.

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

Belcher scholars have increased performance in Science for 5th grade . This area has improved with a strong focus in the rigor of instruction and sharing ownership with all instructional staff. Science instruction was a protected block of time for our school and incorporating science into all other core subjects became a wonderful way to increase Science vocabulary . Through these efforts , Belcher's Science score increased from 55% proficiency to 61% proficiency.

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

Attendance is a great are of concern. Increasing attendance in the lower performing students and ensuring teachers are working closely with parents to identify barriers with attendance.

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

Increase attendance for for all grade levels
Continue to support collaboration and planning with teams to increase knowledge of BEST Standards.
Reboot of the schoolwide PBIS plan. Create incentives and recognition for the students who are exhibiting the desired characteristics.

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 Science

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.

Our school current level of performance is 51%, as evidenced by our state Science assessment. The problem/gap is occurring because all of our students are not demonstrating mastery of standards at the appropriate level of complexity. With teachers and students deepening their understanding of the Florida's State Academic Standards for Science (FSASS-previously named NGSSS) as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes we will increase proficiency to 62%.

When analyzing the content area bands of the 5th grade science assessment, they can be ordered from least to greatest in points earned out of points possible as follows: Nature of Science 6/10 (60%), Earth & Space Science 11/16 (69%), Physical Science 11/16 (69%), and Life Science 10/14 (71%).

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

The percent of 5th grade students earning a proficiency score of level 3 or higher will increase from 51% to 62% on the state NGSSS assessment.

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

Student progress will be monitored on this area of focus through data review cycles with teachers following unit assessments, 5th grade mid-year and Mock SSA, and pre vs post lab assessments. School based leadership team (SBLT) will be analyzing core data including formative assessments and any other district assessments. In addition, SBLT will analyze and track grade-level cohorts to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses to drive future instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Crabb (crabbme@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.)

Teacher Clarity (Hattie, 0.75 effect size)
Prior Ability (Hattie, 0.82 effect size)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher Clarity is important so that teachers have clear intentions and success criteria in mind when presenting science content and able to provide effective feedback on and for learning. To do this, there needs to be a clear understanding of the learning goals that are aligned to the standards. Understanding the depth and breadth of the standards will support this work.
Prior Ability is when teachers activate and integrate prior knowledge and has been proven to be one of the most powerful teaching strategies. It is important to slow down, ask our students what they already know and make important connections to what is to come. Understanding the scope and sequence of the science standards will provide teachers a larger picture of learning - past, present, and future.

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.

During collaborative planning that occurs within school hours or after-school planning sessions, engage in standards vertical articulation to gain a deeper understanding of prior knowledge and future learning to support students' holistic understanding of the Big Ideas in science.

Person Responsible: Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

Ensure professional development is content-focused, teacher and student-focused, instructionally relevant, and actionable.

Person Responsible: Melissa Crabb (crabbme@pcsb.org)

During collaborative planning that occurs within school hours or after-school planning sessions, synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and content limits to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

Person Responsible: Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

Our school's current level of performance is 51%, as evidenced by the state's cycle 3 progress monitoring FAST assessment. The problem/gap is occurring because all students did not engage with enough complex text at grade level aligned to the B.E.S.T. benchmarks. By ensuring that whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block in both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles we will increase the level of performance to 62%.

When analyzing the cycle 3 data the following was noticed:
3rd grade benchmarks that were "below the proficiency standard" and indicated as an "area of weakness" were literary elements (R.1.1), argument (R.2.4), context and connotation (V.1.3), and interpreting figurative language (R.3.1)
4th grade benchmarks that were "below the proficiency standard" and indicated as an "area of weakness" were morphology (V.1.2).
A 4th grade benchmark that was "at/near proficiency standard" and indicated as an "area of weakness" was theme (R.1.2)
5th grade benchmarks that were "below the proficiency standard" and indicated as an "area of weakness" were poetry (R.1.4), interpreting figurative language (R.3.1), and morphology (V.1.2)
5th grade benchmarks that were "at/near proficiency standard" and indicated as an "area of weakness" were theme (R.1.2) and comparative reading (R.3.3)

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

Overall ELA proficiency will increase from 51% to 62% as measured by the state's cycle 3 FAST Reading assessment by May 2024.

Grade 3 ELA proficiency will increase from 41% to 100% as measured by the PM3 FAST Assessment.

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

Student progress will be monitored in this area of focus through data review cycles with teachers following module assessments and each progress monitoring cycle. The school-based leadership team (SBLT) will analyze the core data of the assessments listed above in addition to ISIP (iStation), formative assessments, and any other district assessments. The administration will monitor the implementation of small groups in PreK-3 to 5th-grade classrooms. In addition, SBLT will analyze and track grade-level cohorts to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses of benchmarks to drive future instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Crabb (crabbme@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.)

Explicit and systematic instruction (ESI)
Scaffolded instruction
Corrective feedback
Differentiated instruction during the whole and small-group instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

ESI practice in learning new content, skill, or concept: clear explanations, teacher modeling, Provide a "worked-out" sample with full teacher explanation, Full guidance during student practice, Teacher corrective feedback. A review of 70 studies indicates that failure to provide strong instructional support produced measurable loss of learning: minimal guidance can increase the achievement gap.

Teachers can differentiate classroom elements of student readiness, interest, or learning profile: content–what the student needs to learn or how the student will get access to the information; process–activities the student engages in order to make sense of or master the content; products–culminating projects that ask the student to rehearse, apply, and extend what he or she has learned in a unit; learning environment–the way the classroom works and feels. The most important factor for students achieve more and feel more engaged in school is being sure that what teachers differentiate is high-quality curriculum and instruction.

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.

Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.

Person Responsible: Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

Continue to deepen understanding of the vertical progression and standards design in order to understand what students are expected to master.

Person Responsible: Melissa Crabb (crabbme@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

Our school's current level of performance is 62%, as evidenced by the state's cycle 3 progress monitoring FAST assessment. The problem/gap is occurring because all students did not engage with and practice to the level of rigor that the grade-level math benchmarks expect. By ensuring that teachers and students deepen their understanding of the Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards for Mathematics as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes we will increase the level of performance to 72%.

When analyzing the cycle 3 data the following was noticed:
3rd grade benchmarks that were "below the proficiency standard" and indicated as an "area of weakness" were number sense and additive reasoning-AR.1.2, number sense and multiplicative reasoning-GR.2.1, fractional reasoning-FR.1.1. & FR.1.2., and geometric reasoning, measurement, and data analysis and probability-M.2.1.
A 3rd grade benchmark that was "at/near proficiency standard" and indicated as an "area of weakness" was number sense and additive reasoning-NSO.1.4
A 4th grade benchmark that was "below the proficiency standard" and indicated as an "area of weakness" was number sense and operations with whole numbers-NSO.1.1.
4th grade benchmarks that were "at/near proficiency standard" and indicated as an "area of weakness" were number sense and operations with whole numbers-AR.3.2., NSO.1.2., NSO.1.3., NSO.1.5., number sense and operations with fractions and decimals-FR.1.1., FR.1.2., M.2.2. (also NSO.2.7.)
5th grade benchmarks that were "below the proficiency standard" and indicated as an "area of weakness" were number sense and operations with fractions and decimals-NSO.2.3., geometric reasoning, measurement, and data analysis and probability-GR.3.2.
5th grade benchmarks that were "at/near proficiency standard" and indicated as an "area of weakness" were number sense and operations with whole numbers-NSO.1.1., number sense and operations with fractions and decimals-FR.2.3., FR.2.4., algebraic reasoning-AR.1.1, AR.2.2., and geometric reasoning, measurement, and data analysis and probability-GR.4.2.

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

The percent of students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 62% to 72% as measured by the state's cycle 3 FAST Mathematics assessment by May 2024.

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

Student progress will be monitored on this area of focus through data review cycles with teachers following unit assessments and each state (FAST) progress monitoring cycle. The school based leadership team (SBLT) will analyze core data of the assessments listed above in addition to Dreambox, formative assessments and any other district assessments. In addition, SBLT will analyze and track grade-level cohorts to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses of benchmarks to drive future instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Lewis (lewisda@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.)

Establish mathematical goals to focus learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Shifting from simply stating a standard to communicating learning expectations ensures that goals are appropriate, challenging, and attainable. When goals are specific, revisited throughout the lesson and connect to other mathematics, they become clearer to students. Effective teaching of mathematics establishes clear goals for the mathematics students are learning, situates goals within learning progressions, and uses the goals to inform instructional decisions. Effective Mathematics Teaching Practices (Principles to Actions, NCTM 2014)

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 engage in Collaborative Planning (during or after school) utilizing the Best Instructional Guide to Mathematics (B1G-M) to support Implementation of the B.E.S.T. Standards and other instructional initiatives to analyze the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

Person Responsible: Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

Teachers and administrators collaborate to ensure purposeful peer feedback, engage in ongoing professional development, and develop understanding in PLC's to support the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards, vertical articulation, and promote strong alignment between standard, target and task .

Person Responsible: Melissa Crabb (crabbme@pcsb.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Students with Disabilities continue to fall behind the Federal Index. The problem/gap is occurring because students were not exposed to curriculum at the level of rigor intended.

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

With daily rigorous student-centered instruction in ELA, Math
and Science for all scholars and subgroups, the federal index will increase by 7%.

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

Daily walkthroughs, progress monitoring data and observations with feedback will be used to monitor.

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.)

Create a climate where IEPs are adjusted as needed based on the data and needs of students to maximize the SDI based on skill deficits or improvements so that regular and purposeful adjustments can be made.

Continue to cluster ESE students and build them in the master schedule first in order to optimize service delivery and focus on a clustering process to meet student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When classroom teachers and VE Resource Teachers collaborate, the student has the benefit of having exposure to grade level curriculum and interventions targeted to their specific deficits.

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.

Provide embedded PD and coaching supports centered around utilizing data to drive instruction.

Ensure the ESE teachers receive on going PD aligned to implementing standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

Provide embedded PD and coaching supports centered around utilizing data to drive instruction.

Ensure the ESE teachers receive on going PD aligned to implementing standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

#5. 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.

The school maintains a comprehensive PBIS plan that is shared with all stakeholders and explicitly taught and practiced across the year to cultivate a positive school culture and environment. Everyone is responsible
for their words, actions and contributing to the supportive network.
Family Engagement events are planned across the year with the specific focus of increasing trusting relationships around the four C's (1) cognition- beliefs and values (2) connections networks (3) capabilities , skills and knowledge (4) confidence – self-efficacy. The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

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

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

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

The problem/gap is occurring because lack of high engagement strategies and corrective instruction are being implemented.

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

Our percentage of black students in grades 3-5 achieving ELA proficiency is 41%,
as evidenced in our 2022 EOY FSA data. Black student proficiency in ELA will increase 13% (from 41% to 54%), as measured by the state assessment.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through interim unit assessments including content area and diagnostic assessment data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Lewis (lewisda@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.)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/ scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. Enhance their knowledge of our African-American students background knowledge so as to provide scaffolds to reach these complex tasks.

Students and families made aware and able to monitor/ celebrate student achievement will experience heightened academic success and increased proficiency.

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.

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

Person Responsible: Dawn Lewis (lewisda@pcsb.org)

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The Leadership Team will continue to identify strategies and curriculum supplements to increase the level of engagement and proficiency with our ESE population. Funds will be allocated to best support professional development opportunities for teachers to increase their teaching capacity as well as materials to support learning . The School Advisory Council and Instructional staff will also provide feedback on the funding ideas targeted to assist with this group of learners.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

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

Strategically focus on exposing 3-5 students to instruction that is on the appropriate grade level and complexity , by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Our percentage of students in grades K-2 achieving ELA proficiency will be greater than 70% as evidenced in our 2024 EOY STAR data.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Our percentage of students in grades 3-5 achieving ELA proficiency is 70% as evidenced in our 2024 EOY FSA data.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Student progress will be monitored in this area of focus through data review cycles with teachers following module assessments and each progress monitoring cycle. The school-based leadership team (SBLT) will analyze the core data of the assessments listed above in addition to ISIP (iStation), formative assessments, and any other district assessments. The administration will monitor the implementation of small groups in PreK-3 to 5th-grade classrooms. In addition, SBLT will analyze and track grade-level cohorts to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses of benchmarks to drive future instruction.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lewis, Dawn, lewisda@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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?

Explicit and systematic instruction (ESI)
Scaffolded instruction
Corrective feedback
Differentiated instruction during the whole and small-group instruction

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

ESI practice in learning new content, skill, or concept: clear explanations, teacher modeling, Provide a "worked-out" sample with full teacher explanation, Full guidance during student practice, Teacher corrective feedback. A review of 70 studies indicates that failure to provide strong instructional support produced measurable loss of learning: minimal guidance can increase the achievement gap.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Provide time for gen ed and ESE staff to collaborate and co-plan on developing SDI that meets the needs of students. Collaborate to create a schedule that promotes a “push-in” model of learning support (VE Resource Starr and general education teachers) delivery of services. Create a climate where IEPs are adjusted as needed based on the data and needs of students to maximize the SDI based on skill deficits or improvements so that regular and purposeful adjustments can be made.	Lewis, Dawn, lewisda@pcsb.org
Provide embedded PD and coaching supports centered around utilizing data to drive instruction. Ensure the ESE teachers receive on going PD aligned to implementing standards-based instruction. Continue to cluster ESE students and build them in the master schedule first in order to optimize service delivery and focus on a clustering process to meet student needs.	Lewis, Dawn, lewisda@pcsb.org