

Pinellas County Schools

Frontier 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	27
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	27
VI. Title I Requirements	30
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Frontier Elementary School

6995 HOPEDALE LN, Clearwater, FL 33764

<http://www.frontier-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.

We are committed to: Ensure all stakeholders will work together to create a safe community that encourages students to become thinkers and problem solvers who are ready for higher education and success in a global society.

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
Owens, Gina	Principal	
Stevens, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	Supervise all staff members, monitor instruction and support student learning.

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.

Feedback was gathered from all staff during a meeting to ensure they had ample time to provide suggestions and action steps to meet goals. All stakeholders were given a chance to share feedback during School Advisory Committee meetings.

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))

All classrooms will have a SIP One Pager posted in their room and refer to it throughout the year. Administrations will conduct daily walk throughs to monitor delivery of academic standards to ensure closure of achievement gap.

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	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	40	28	36	40	24	0	0	0	168	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	20	3	0	0	0	0	23	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	20	8	0	0	0	0	28	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	42	29	0	0	0	75	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	24	27	0	0	0	54	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	27	13	0	0	0	45	

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	5	27	13	0	0	0	45

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	1	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	11	35	46	32	32	38	0	0	0	194	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in 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	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	0	10	26	10	16	0	0	0	72	

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	2	16	16	48	48	38	0	0	0	168

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	11	35	46	32	32	38	0	0	0	194
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	0	10	26	10	16	0	0	0	72

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	2	16	16	48	48	38	0	0	0	168

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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*	43			49			54		
ELA Learning Gains	64			59			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65			38			59		
Math Achievement*	56			48			68		
Math Learning Gains	67			46			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55			29			40		
Science Achievement*	48			56			62		

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			47			52		

* 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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	463
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
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	43			
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	74			

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	53			
HSP	58			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	59			

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	43	64	65	56	67	55	48					65
SWD	12	38	64	25	58	60						47
ELL	33	66	71	53	72	75	24					65
AMI												
ASN	57	80		79	80							
BLK	38	67	60	50	63	38	58					
HSP	42	66	59	55	74	54	44					66
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	43	59	71	58	62	69	46					
FRL	39	63	68	56	66	59	46					72

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	49	59	38	48	46	29	56					47
SWD	26	50		17	13		25					7
ELL	39	54		40	40		52					47

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	67			75								
BLK	36	73		39	64		45					
HSP	48	60	45	47	34		52					47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	51	55		47	47		59					
FRL	46	58	40	45	42	24	49					44

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	54	49	59	68	58	40	62					52
SWD	29	26	30	41	23		44					71
ELL	45	55		72	76		47					52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	62		55	62		53					
HSP	55	53	75	73	72		69					51
MUL	64			82								
PAC												
WHT	55	44	50	66	44	33	60					
FRL	48	47	63	65	55	41	59					50

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.

ELA showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors were lack of phonemic awareness, multisyllabic words and applying strategies to their reading instruction. Our trends have shown that as students move from primary to grade 5, the percentage of proficiency increases.

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

All of our data has increased proficiency from the previous year.

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.

Our ELA proficiency had the largest gap compared to the state average. Factors that contribute to the gap are lack of phonemic awareness skills.

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

We had a substantial increase in our science proficiency. Actions that lead to this improvement would be teaching the vocabulary, including the science topics in ELA and teaching STEM labs once per month schoolwide. We also implemented a strong phonic routine, data chats and daily monitoring in the classrooms.

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

Attendance is a concern. If students are not at school, they cannot learn.

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

ELA proficiency in grade 3, ELA proficiency in grade 4, Math proficiency in grade 4, Science proficiency in grade 5 and increasing writing instruction is all grades.

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 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 2023 level of performance was 49% proficient as evidenced in the PM3 FAST/state assessment of English Language Arts. We expect our proficiency level to be 65%, our learning gains level to be 70% and the learning gains of L25 students to be 70% by May of 2024.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all students achieving English Language Arts proficiency will increase from 49% to 65% as measured by the PM3 Florida State Assessment of English Language Arts.

The percent of students making learning gains in English Language Arts will increase to 70% as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking in English Language Arts.

The students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in English Language Arts will increase to 70% as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking in English Language Arts.

The students in 3rd grade achieving proficiency will increase to 70% as measured by the PM3 Florida State Assessment of English Language Arts.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring by administrators will occur by leaders partnering with teachers attending ELA Champion professional development sessions. Administrators will attend site based, grade level Professional Leadership Communities to support collaborative planning. Follow up monitoring will occur through classroom visits followed by actionable feedback and collaborative data analysis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gina Owens (owensg@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.)

Create a culture of collaboration by establishing demonstration/model classrooms at each grade level where ELA teachers learn from and inspire one another. We will also continue to implement Flamingo small groups in all grades to address reading deficits and increase proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The problem/gap is occurring because of the need for increased focus on rigorous standards-based instruction. If an increased focus on rigorous standards-based instruction would occur, the proficiency/scores would increase by 16%. With the implementation of the B.E.S.T standards in the intermediate grades, teachers will need support from each other as well as district coaches.

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.

Leaders and teachers attend ELA champion meetings partnering to empower ELA champions/cohort teachers to develop as literacy leaders specifically relating to B.E.S.T standards.

Build reading stamina in every grade level.

Continue basing small groups in primary on ELFAC data and use the ELFAC data to drive instruction.

Utilize ELFAC data in 3rd grade for students that are not on grade level.

Person Responsible: Gina Owens (owensg@pcsb.org)

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

Provide continuing professional development for teachers to enhance skills with small group guided reading strategies and with "Science of Reading".

Implement schoolwide book buddies 30 minutes each week. 5th grade with 2nd grade, 4th-1st grade, and 3rd- 1st grade. This will help highlight the importance of reading for all children schoolwide.

Person Responsible: Gina Owens (owensg@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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 2023 level of performance was 60% proficient as evidenced in the 2023 Florida State Assessment of Mathematics. We expect our proficiency level to be 65%, our learning gains level to be 70% and the learning gains of L25 students to be 65% by May of 2024.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all students achieving Mathematics proficiency will increase from 60% to 65% as measured by the Florida State Assessment of Mathematics. The percent of students making learning gains in Mathematics will increase to 70% as measured by the Florida State Assessment of Mathematics. The students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics will increase to 65% as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking in Mathematics.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring by administrators will occur by leaders partnering with teachers attending math professional development sessions. Administrators will attend site based, grade level Professional Leadership Communities to support collaborative planning. Follow up monitoring will occur through classroom visits followed by actionable feedback and collaborative data analysis.

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.)

Effective use of Professional Learning Communities by using assessment purposefully and analyzing Common Exit Tickets, readiness assessments, and Unit Assessments. Ensure that all teachers collaboratively engage in mathematics unit planning to include rigorous, grade level content, purposeful practice, and remediation/enrichment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The problem/gap is occurring because of the need for increased focus on rigorous standards-based instruction. If an increased focus on rigorous standards-based instruction would occur, the proficiency/scores would increase by 5%. The teachers have been trained in the B.E.S.T. standards by district coaches and in order to allow students to practice the skills learned, they need to be equipped with manipulatives and foundations of mathematics.

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 Just-in-Time B.E.S.T. PD becoming familiar with the design to understand what students need to master; including the progression of standards, coding scheme, MTR's and stages of fluency.

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

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

Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily using FL Reveal Math, DreamBox Learning, Number Routines, and other standards-aligned resources.

Person Responsible: Gina Owens (owensg@pcsb.org)

Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, positive expectations for success; meaningful tasks related to student interests & cultural backgrounds; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.

Facilitate mathematics-focused, consistent, sustained professional development through Professional Learning Communities by empowering mathematics teacher leaders to facilitate alongside administrators.

Person Responsible: Gina Owens (owensg@pcsb.org)

#3. 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.

Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is a referral risk ratio of 6.6% as reported in the School Profiles data base. We expect our level of performance to be a risk level of 4.5 % as reported in School Profiles by May 2024.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of students receiving referrals will decrease from 17 students to 12 students, as evidenced by School Profiles discipline data.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring by administrators will occur by leaders partnering with staff to participate professional development sessions with a focus on PBIS, Equity and Restorative Practices. Administrators, PBIS coordinator and Restorative Practices trainer will facilitate site based, professional collaborative planning and dialog. Follow up monitoring will occur through school walkthroughs followed by actionable feedback and collaborative data analysis.

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.)

Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because a need for increased implementation of culturally responsive teaching strategies. If the increased use of culturally responsive teaching strategies would occur, the problem would be reduced by 1.7% as evidenced by School Profiles data. We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation by May 2024.

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.

Utilize a system of recognition to provide rewards to students for demonstration of positive and appropriate behaviors that are identified in the schoolwide expectations. At least 90% of school members

will participate in the reward system and the rewards will be varied and reflect student interests.

Each day, classroom teachers will greet and welcome students using trust generated actions, building rapport and strong relationships.

Analyze and monitor discipline data and plan necessary strategies at monthly PBIS meetings.

During the first week of school, teachers and students will collaboratively develop classroom agreements that reflect the schoolwide expectations by engaging student voices and submit class agreements/expectations to the PBIS coordinator.

Classroom teachers will conduct weekly class meetings/community building circles that reflect the schoolwide expectations.

Staff contact at least 2 student families with positive feedback on student performance weekly and log the contact in FOCUS.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Stevens (stevensste@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.

Our level of performance of SWD is 18%, as evidenced in our 2023 Florida State Assessment of English Language Arts data. We expect our ELA FAST and Math FAST performance level to be 50% proficient by the end of the 2023-2024 school year. The problem/gap is occurring due to the lack of inclusion structures where the Gen-ed and VE Resource teachers collaboratively team teach to provide differentiation. If both, Gen-ed and VE Resource teachers consistently utilize data to plan for differentiation and scaffold instruction to increase the achievement of SWD, the problem/gap would be reduced by closing the achievement gap between our ESE and non-ESE students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of ESE students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 18% to 50%, as measured by the 2024 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking in ELA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Ensure that an inclusion model where both, Gen-Ed and VE Resource teachers intentionally plan for the differentiated needs of EACH student with consideration of the principles of UDL to ensure content is accessible to the broadest range of learners.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gina Owens (owensg@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.)

Ensure that an inclusion model where both, Gen-Ed and VE Resource teachers intentionally plan for the differentiated needs of EACH student with consideration of the principles of UDL to ensure content is accessible to the broadest range of learners.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on the learning gains and trend data of schools with similar ESE populations; school leaders shared that implementing an inclusion (pushin) model is one of the major the contributing factors to increased ESE improvement.

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.

ESE and classroom teachers routinely collaboratively plan for grade level student-centered complex tasks deliberately designed with a trajectory of rigor and challenge utilizing appropriate ESE strategies including: higher level questioning and explicit vocabulary instruction.

Monitor the use of appropriate curriculum and supportive strategies to ensure student needs are met.

Embed metacognitive strategies into content-based instruction to teach students critical memory and engagement processes they can use to access, retain, and generalize important content.

Ensure the cohesive use of Thinking Maps across content areas to make the learning more student centered and differentiated for each individual learner.

Participate in professional development associated with but not limited to the above action steps.

Person Responsible: Gina Owens (owensg@pcsb.org)

#5. 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 2023 level of performance was 74% proficient as evidenced by the 2023 Florida Statewide Science Assessment. We expect our proficiency level to be 75% by May of 2024. We will have STEAM clubs in grades 2-5 as well as Extended Learning Programs that focus on science content for grades 3-5 after school.

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 Science proficiency will increase from 74% to 75% as measured by the Florida Statewide Science Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring by administrators will occur by leaders partnering with teachers attending science professional development sessions. Administrators will attend site based, grade level Professional Leadership Communities to support collaborative planning. Follow up monitoring will occur through classroom visits followed by actionable feedback and collaborative data analysis.

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.)

Support and utilize formal and informal assessment strategies that inform instruction. Identify proficiency levels and implement instructional strategies to increase development of key content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The problem/gap is occurring because of the need for increased focus on rigorous standards-based instruction. If an increased focus on rigorous standards-based instruction would occur, the proficiency/scores would increase by 1%. With the implementation of the NGSSS standards in the intermediate grades, teachers will need support from each other as well as district coaches.

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.

Integrate Science into ELA and small guided reading groups using informational texts.

Full Science investigation using the 5E's in all grades. Teacher-Led in K-2, but hands on for students, and Student-Led in 3-5 with the teacher as the facilitator.

Grade Level and Cross Grade Level articulation to ensure missing standards are being taught at the correct depth of knowledge.

Person Responsible: Gina Owens (owensg@pcsb.org)

Implement and monitor science gaming based on continuous data, with a focus on 60 Power Words and other related vocabulary based on grade level standards.

Introduce a digital component so students will have access from anywhere to continue their explorations.

Person Responsible: Gina Owens (owensg@pcsb.org)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**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.

In the 2023- 2024 school year we will have high expectations for all of our students including our English Language Learners. Our subgroup proficiency scores have shown minimal growth over the year. We believe there is a foundational literacy gap with a high percentage of our students. It is our firm belief that providing high expectations for our scholars with standards aligned rigorous instruction and an additional focus on ELD (English Language Development), it will lead to a much-improved overall school score.

Teachers need to systematically and strategically address both language-based and code-based skills, showing how these components of the language system interact; thus, enabling students to be effective code breakers, meaning makers, text users, and text analysts. Particularly for ELs, the interaction between code-based and language-based aspects of the English language might be less intuitive. For example, teachers can connect decoding and encoding to word-level instruction by including the meaning of words and their meaningful parts (morphemes). Word-level instruction can be connected to text-level instruction to understand the formation of sentences.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of EL students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 26% to 50%, as measured by the 2024 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking in ELA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored by end of module assessments, ISIP, checks for understanding, looking at FAST and walk-through feedback from the instructional leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gina Owens (owensg@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.)

We are clustering students based on language proficiency, instructional needs and data to provide an inclusive, core environment for all students. In addition, all students will have access to the on grade level text. They will be required to perform the same tasks with necessary supports. Data for each student will be examined to determine foundational gaps and instruction will occur during intervention block and core instructional time to close learning gaps. Additional learning opportunities are provided outside of the school day to broaden background knowledge, schema, vocabulary and experiences.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All students will learn the BEST standards and have a better chance of mastering grade level standards. All teachers will plan collaboratively with instructional coaches and prepare to teach collaboratively in order to provide specialized instruction that is aligned to grade level standards. Foundational gaps will be addressed during the intervention block in small groups.

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.

EL teachers will plan collaboratively to front load content, vocabulary and context to scaffold up to the rigor of the standard for our EL and Hispanic subgroups. During collaborative planning EL teachers will ensure classroom teachers have identified each LY student and their proficiency level. EL teachers and coaches will provide support using the MPI's embedded within the modules. Just in time coaching will be requested from the EL department as needed.

Person Responsible: Gina Owens (owensg@pcsb.org)

#7. 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.

Based on the 22-23 school year FAST data, 49% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA. African American sub group performed at the index of %. This is % below expectation.

Our area of focus is to;

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Given the FAST statewide assessment in the Spring 2024, 65% of African American subgroup will perform at the proficiency level.

Monitoring:

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

- Regularly occurring walkthroughs during core instruction as well as intervention occurring with fidelity, through the use of targeted instruction.
- Star Early Lit. for VPK, K and 1st
- Star Reading for 2nd
- ELFAC data being collected and used to drive small group instruction, this would be evident and monitored in small group lesson plans.
- Evidence of on-going progress monitoring will be aligned and show continuous growth, based on the targeted intervention.
- Teacher will informally assess running record level monthly, this will be monitored through the MTSS data collection.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gina Owens (owensg@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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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.

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

Person Responsible: Gina Owens (owensg@pcsb.org)

Walkthroughs monitoring small group instruction and effectiveness in classrooms

Person Responsible: Gina Owens (owensg@pcsb.org)

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

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

PLC reflection forms will reflect an area for disaggregated data

Person Responsible: Gina Owens (owensg@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 district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.

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

Focus on 3-5 teachers and instruction to ensure that teachers are pulling small groups that are tied to the core instruction using differentiation to meet the needs of all learners. Teachers will receive professional development as well as walk through feedback weekly.

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

Each student in grade k-2 will achieve grade level proficiency of at least 60% or more students on the PM3 FAST assessment in the spring 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Each student in grade 3-5 will achieve grade level proficiency of at least 60% or more students on the PM3 FAST assessment in the spring 2024.

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.

Weekly walk thoughts will be conducted by coaches and administration to provide feedback on small group work. All module assessments will be monitored to ensure that students are making grade level progress and monthly ISIP reports will be pulled to monitor progress is being made in the classroom.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Owens, Gina, owensg@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?

- o Provides print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction
- o Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words
- o Reinforce the effectiveness of instruction in alphabets, fluency, and vocabulary
- o Provide instruction in broad oral language skills
- o Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies
- o Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension

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?

To develop literacy, students need instruction in two related sets of skills: foundational reading skills and reading comprehension skills. Employing the evidence-based strategies and action steps will enable students to read words (alphabets), relate those words to their oral language, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency to understand what they read.

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
<p>o Literacy Leadership</p> <p>? School Literacy Leadership Teams are meeting regularly to look at data to make informed decisions about what professional learning and supports need to be in place to maximize student growth in reading.</p> <p>? Build capacity by identifying teachers, coaches and district staff who can support training in the use of evidence-based curriculum, instruction, and intervention aligned to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.</p> <p>? School Literacy Leadership Team plan family reading nights grounded in family friendly evidence-based practices to support the homeschool connection</p>	<p>Owens, Gina, owensg@pcsb.org</p>
<p>Literacy Coaching</p> <p>? Literacy coaches work with school principals to plan and implement consistent professional learning using strategies that demonstrate a significant effect on improving student outcomes.</p> <p>? Literacy coaches prioritize time to those teachers, activities, and roles that will have the greatest impact on student achievement in reading, namely coaching, modeling, and mentoring in classrooms daily.</p> <p>? Literacy coaches support and train teachers to administer assessments, analyze data and use data to differentiate instruction.</p>	<p>Stevens, Stephanie, stevensste@pcsb.org</p>
<p>Assessment</p> <p>? Develop a structure for ongoing formative assessment is in place to determine where instruction should be modified to meet individual student needs</p> <p>? Determine a structure for conducting screening, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessments is in place to identify students with a substantial deficiency in reading.</p>	<p>Stevens, Stephanie, stevensste@pcsb.org</p>
<p>Professional learning</p> <p>? Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are guided by assessment data and are ongoing, engaging, interactive, collaborative, and job-embedded and provide time for teachers to collaborate, research, conduct lesson studies, and plan instruction.</p> <p>? School-based teams are provided professional learning sessions on the science of reading and evidence-based literacy instruction, materials, and assessment.</p> <p>? School-based teams provide training to teachers that integrate the six components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language, comprehension, and vocabulary) into an explicit, systematic, and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies.</p>	<p>Owens, Gina, owensg@pcsb.org</p>

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

To ensure that we meet all parent schedules and to create a supportive relationship between home and school we plan to offer activities at a variety of days and times throughout the year. We will host curriculum meetings once per month to share schoolwide expectations so that their child will be successful during and after school. We will provide parents with content specific sessions, aligned with the B.E.S.T. standards, identifying strategies they can use at home to promote highest student achievement specific to reading, writing, and math. We will communicate benchmarks once a week through ClassDojo, email and newsletters so families are aware of what their child is learning each week. Conferences will be held twice per year to address all academic concerns and questions families may have during the fall and spring semester. All events will be advertised at least 3 weeks in advance so planning on families can take place.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We post our calendar for the entire school year in August so that families have time to plan to attend. Conferences are held several times throughout the school year to update parents on student progress as well as how to support and plan for the quarter looking ahead. We use ClassDojo to support communication with parents to update student progress, success and how to support their academic needs. ClassDojo is used schoolwide for both academic purposes and for PBIS.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We use ClassDojo for parents to have the easiest way to connect with the school and teachers, as this connects to parents' phones. ClassDojo gives parents an immediate connection to the classroom and classwork. This also translates to the language the parent sets. Teachers can send information to families to support learning. Students in grades first through fifth have one-to-one devices and in grades three through five can take them home. We host ELA, Math and Science events at night to support the at home learning by educating families on strategies they can use to further their child's education. This year, we will be offering new clubs before and after school to increase attendance and academics.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

We offer our events on a variety of nights during the week. We post our calendar for the entire school year in August so that families have time to plan to attend. We also hold several events throughout the school year during the mornings, for example, we hold a monthly event for families – All Pro Families. We also held a celebration for all cultures in September in the morning, this event was one of our biggest events this school year. Home visits are made when needed by several members of our staff to support families based on their needs.