

Pinellas County Schools

Perkins 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	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Perkins Elementary School

2205 18TH AVE S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

<http://www.perkins-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.

The mission of Perkins Elementary School is to provide a positive learning environment and quality educational experiences, thus enabling our students to reach their full potential academically, socially, creatively, and culturally through the cooperative efforts of the family, school and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kranzel, Laura	Principal	
Lennox, Daniel	Assistant Principal	
Stickles, Kimberly	School Counselor	

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.

End of 21-22 and on-going 22-23 data was shared with staff and SAC regularly throughout the year to have discussions on areas of focus, strengths and areas for growth. Monthly meetings included discussions on SIP and use of staff and funding. This will continue with 22-23 end of year data and 23-24 on-going data.

As the SIP draft is written, staff and SAC will be meeting to review, revise and put into action or plan. At Open House, all families will be asked to review and comment on components of the plan. SIP will then be refined and accepted by staff and SAC.

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))

End of 22-23 and on-going 23-24 data will be shared with staff and SAC regularly throughout the year to have discussions on areas of focus, strengths and areas for growth. Monthly meetings will include discussions on SIP and Title I plans, use of staff and funding. We will continue to review and revise the

plan based on data. Monitoring teams will be set up to focus on individual student growth and review data at SBLT and PLCs to make decisions for each student as needed.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	74%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	<i>Data will be uploaded when available</i>
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: C 2020-21: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	13	19	12	12	15	0	0	0	71	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	18	0	0	0	34	
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		

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	1	0	9	5	0	0	0	15

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	30	24	17	14	16	0	0	0	101	
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	17	
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.	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	0	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	6	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	30	24	17	14	16	0	0	0	101
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	17
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.	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	0	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	6	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	14
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*	52			58			66		
ELA Learning Gains	59			38			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43			30			52		
Math Achievement*	54			47			64		
Math Learning Gains	61			40			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40			24			23		
Science Achievement*	62			53			69		

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									

* 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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	371
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	25	Yes	3	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				

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	35	Yes	3	
HSP	77			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	44			

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	52	59	43	54	61	40	62					
SWD	26	32	10	29	26							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	40	40	33	45	31	30					
HSP	68	67		73	100							
MUL	80			70								
PAC												
WHT	81	80		77	72		83					
FRL	38	48	38	42	54	37	50					

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	58	38	30	47	40	24	53					
SWD	23	21	20	16	36	30	23					
ELL												

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												
BLK	32	25	29	28	28	20	34					
HSP	85			70								
MUL	88			69								
PAC												
WHT	78	50		61	48		70					
FRL	41	24	22	33	26	19	37					

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	66	67	52	64	57	23	69					
SWD	14	26	25	24	29	19	17					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	57	52	43	37	15	31					
HSP	88	77		85	69							
MUL	75			53								
PAC												
WHT	81	73		81	73		95					
FRL	48	58	50	46	42	18	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.

While all three tested subject areas ended at about the same percentage of proficient students, our Black and SWD subgroups continue to perform significantly below the total percentage of proficiency and the other subgroups. 5th grade was our lowest trending scores in both growth from PM1 to PM3, as well as percentage of proficiency in PM3.

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

Science proficiency declined from 62% proficient to 56% proficient. The factor that we believe contributed to this decline was that overall Reading proficiency for that particular group of students (in 2022, the 5th grade ELA proficiency was 67%, the 4th grade was 45%).

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 5th grade scores overall had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. This particular cohort was also our lowest cohort last year. Their reading proficiency is what we believe contributed to the trend.

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

ELA proficiency showed the most improvement (52 to 57). Small group, targeted, standards-based reading intervention implemented in grades 3-5.

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

The few students who have 2 or more EWS are an area of concern, as is our number of L1 students in ELA and Math in grades 4/5.

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

Teacher collaboration, 3rd grade reading proficiency, SWD and Black Subgroups, Family Engagement

Area of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

SWD and Black subgroup students are performing below the 41% ESSA threshold. This has been an ongoing concern, however we are seeing some improvement in our Black subgroup scores.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All of our subgroups will score 41% or higher proficiency, as measured by FAST 2024.

Monitoring:

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

In PM1, PM2, and through district assessments, we will progress monitor by subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Lennox (lennox@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.)

Utilizing our Title 1 hourly teachers in partnership with classroom teachers, we will consistently implement targeted small-groups, which are standards-based and data informed interventions (Magnetic Readers).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Individualized and data-based instruction for students.

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.

Progress monitoring at each available assessment point.

Use of data to target individual needs and form groups.

Person Responsible: Daniel Lennox (lennox@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**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.

When analyzing student proficiency, as well as growth, there are discrepancies between teachers in the same grade levels. If teachers are collaboratively planning, there should not be such vast differences, especially in the growth from PM1 to PM3.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Grade level teams will meet weekly in order to have focused, collaborative planning time. Student growth from PM1 to PM3 will be more similar if this is occurring with fidelity and all team members participating fully.

Student proficiency at the end of the year will be 65% in all three subject areas: ELA, Math, and Science.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators, as well as the Reading Coach, will monitor and participate in the collaborative planning sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Kranzel (kranzell@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.)

Literacy coaches support and train teachers to administer assessments, analyze data and use data to differentiate instruction. This can and should transfer over to our work on analyzing data in Math as well.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Literacy coaches work with school principals to plan and implement consistent professional learning using strategies that demonstrate a significant effect on improving student outcomes.

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.

Collaborative planning sessions will be scheduled regularly at the same time each week. The master schedule has been adjusted to accommodate this.

Person Responsible: Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

Cultivating a supportive environment - Increase parent engagement in academic areas. While our school has high parent engagement, it is focused on the arts and student performances.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will alter our family engagement activities to increase attendance and incorporate the academic areas, as well as the areas of the arts.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor the integration of the academics and the performance calendar. We will provide resources for families to take home with them and utilize survey results to monitor participant engagement and feedback.

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.)

Offering opportunities for the school community to provide feedback on programs, systems, and policies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As a new to Title 1 school, our activities are going to be changing slightly this year to increase engagement and a focus on academics. This is a baseline year and we will solicit feedback to gauge the satisfaction and results.

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

#4. 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.

BEST ELA Standards understanding

Measurable Outcome:

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

Deepen understanding of the FL BEST ELA standards and benchmarks as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes to overall ELA proficiency of 65% as measured by PM3 FAST.

Grade 3 ELA proficiency will increase to 70% as measured by PM3 FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Instructional staff will be encouraged to attend professional development outside of the school, as well as job embedded PD provided by ISDs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Kranzel (kranzell@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.)

Identifying critical content and teacher clarity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As teachers become more skilled in this strategy, they will see remarkable changes in students' abilities to process and understand new content because they are able to identify which content is critical and understand how learned content scaffolds in complexity.

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 regular structures for planning/plcs where teachers regularly engage in data/student work analysis, identify critical content, as well as engage in the intellectual prep required to teach the lessons including planning for scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible: Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Coaching**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.

K-2 ELA instruction with a focus on acceleration and cycles of coaching feedback.

Measurable Outcome:

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

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.

Monitoring:

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

Our ELA coach will provide and monitor coaching cycles.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Kranzel (kranzell@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.)

Provide print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction to support encoding, decoding, comprehension, and fluency/accuracy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To develop literacy, students need instruction in two related sets of skills: foundational and comprehension. Employing these will enable students to read words and relate them to their oral language, and read connected text with fluency and accuracy to enhance comprehension.

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.

Engage in ongoing professional development on the implementation of high-quality curricular materials, including norming walks for excellence, studying student responses, and robust and constructive feedback.

Person Responsible: Laura Kranzel (kranzell@pcsb.org)

#6. 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.

Deepen understanding of BEST standards for Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Mathematical goals present in each lesson, to lead to 65% of students proficient on the state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Collaborative planning with hubs, administration, and ISDs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Lennox (lennoxd@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. Using the goals to inform instructional decisions.

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 admin engage in Collaborative Planning utilizing B1G-M to support implementation of the BEST Standards to analyze the benchmarks and understand expected outcomes.

Person Responsible: Daniel Lennox (lennoxd@pcsb.org)

#7. 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.

Science Standards need to be fully understood by teachers in order to improve student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will score 65% or higher proficiency on the state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Admin and teachers will collaboratively plan and analyze data and lessons to support intentions and success criteria to provide feedback to students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Kranzel (kranzell@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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It is important for teachers to have clear intentions and success criteria in mind when presenting science content. They also need to be able to provide feedback for learning with a clear understanding of the learning goals.

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.

Synthesize the benchmarks, clarification, and content limits to fully understand the expected outcomes in collaborative, standards-based, planning.

Person Responsible: Laura Kranzel (kranzell@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).

Staff provides suggestions on needs for SIP funds based on data. SAC further reviews the suggestions and potential impact on achievement before approving.

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.

Dissemination will occur at our Open House/Title I Annual Meeting on August 23. We will utilize school messenger (phone, text, email), as well as Class Dojo, and paper flyers to send information home to families who might not be able to attend.

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))

Information was shared at our Kindergarten Orientation night / PTA general meeting on May 11, 2023. This will happen again at Open House in the Fall. PTA and SAC meetings will also be held, where timely information is shared. Our monthly newsletter will provide information by grade level, as well as school wide. The grade level teams also provide specific newsletters to their families. This is shared via Dojo and email. Student led conferences and data chats are scheduled throughout the year, coinciding with assessment results and grading periods.

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))

SBLT Team, CST, and Teacher PLCs all use data to create next steps and make any necessary adjustments. The gaps in the use of data are at the classroom teacher level as we are still learning new standards and assessments.

Various teams look at different data. At the leadership level, the questions look at school-wide performance. At the teacher level, the questions look at specific classroom and student performance. The ILT/SBLTs and PLCs use a variety of data (e.g., attendance, behavior, common assessments, etc.). All of this data is being used, however not consistently by each group or level. The greatest gaps are evident in our students with disabilities and students in the black subgroup.

Teachers are not completely comfortable with analyzing data and using it to plan.

If teachers participate in PLCs and Collaborative Planning, based on standards-based data analysis,

guided by an administrator or coach, they would be able to plan instruction focused on the needs of the students. The follow up PLCs could then use a student work analysis protocol, guided by a coach or administrator, to determine next steps in Collaborative Planning for enrichment, remediation, or intervention lessons to close the gaps.

Making real time adjustments and / or implementing new strategies to drive instruction and monitoring whether the work. Based on the alignment of interventions and resources, we will consistently use a variety of data sources to focus on the greatest needs of each student. A plan for data analysis that clearly states which data points will focused on and a timeline will be followed.

Reading Coach will facilitate data analysis and monitoring of effectiveness of strategies. Hourly teachers will be supporting students based on data analysis.

Grade level teams participate in collaborative planning and plcs. Small group instruction and interventions occur in each classroom, but also to varying extents. Data analysis, PLCs, Collaborative Planning, Small Group instruction and Intervention is all in need of more guidance / parameters, and intentionality.

Scheduled PLCs and Collaborative Planning with administrator and K-2 Literacy Coach support were implemented this year, they worked to improve student achievement, however it there is a need for additional growth.

The greatest barrier in this area was the inconsistency of support and follow through. The Literacy Coach was focused on K-2, there was no coach at our school available to consistently support 3rd-5th. Implementing small groups and interventions solely fell on the classroom teacher, there was not hourly teacher support for all grade levels throughout the year.

Consistently planning for and implementing small groups and interventions across all grade levels. Including timely progress monitoring in order to specifically drive instruction.

There is a clear leader identified who meets regularly with teams and is held accountable for professional learning and planning. There is a coaching model with direct connections to student outcome data. We are working to actively build capacity and support where necessary and to remove barriers for quality coaching and collaborative planning.

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))

n/a