Oakhurst Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Oakhurst Elementary School

10535 137TH ST, Largo, FL 33774

http://www.oakhurst-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 Oakhurst Elementary School is to educate and inspire each student to reach maximum potential, become lifelong learners and responsible citizens through the Mustang Way.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Oakhurst Elementary is 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
Kennedy, Kelly	Principal	Oversees the school, Oversees the ILT, facilitates PD, MTSS process, Oversees all budgets, SAC, PTA, Family Engagement, CST, Teacher evaluations and walk throughs, facilitates the School Leadership Team and the Instructional leadership team, Equity Champion
Smith, Chelsea	Assistant Principal	Learning Specialist, Instructional Leader, Testing Coordinator, PBIS Coordinator, MTSS team member, Equity Champion
Sanders, Tracey	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Specialist; PBIS Team Member, Equity Champion
Pratt, Alexis	School Counselor	MTSS Team Member, Mustang Round-Up, Classroom Guidance, CST Member, 504 Coordinator, Equity Champion
Cuzzucoli, Gregg	Teacher, K-12	PE Teacher, Healthy Schools Coordinator

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.

Kelly Kennedy and Chelsea Smith collected feedback from families and staff members on the SIP plan throughout the 2022-2023 school year and used that feedback to create the 2023-2024 School Improvement Plan. The plan is to be presented to staff prior to the school year starting. The School

Improvement Plan will be presented to the School Advisory Council on the first meeting of the school year taking place on 8/22. This meeting will be open to all stakeholders, the required attendees will include: Kelly Kennedy (principal), Chelsea Smith (assistant principal), Amy Mclaughlin (parent), and Nancy Wagner (parent).

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))

Teachers will continuously monitor goals and outcomes based on the data as they will meet every third Tuesday of the month in their designated goal committees. The School Advisory Council will meet once a month after school hours on the third Tuesday of each month to discuss school goals and progress made towards reaching those goals as it pertains to the data collected.

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	26%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	*Data will be uploaded when available*
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: A 2020-21: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	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.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	32	22	18	26	20	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	14	13	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	2	1	8	1	2	0	0	0	15

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) 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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	0	32	22	18	26	20	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	14	13	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	2	1	8	1	2	0	0	0	15

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	69			69			69		
ELA Learning Gains	69			65			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53			52			40		
Math Achievement*	78			73			79		
Math Learning Gains	74			65			68		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54			26			48		
Science Achievement*	71			69			68		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	468
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	39	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	69			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	53			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	69	69	53	78	74	54	71					
SWD	37	44	43	44	42	31	31					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	62		60	54		50					
HSP	60	77		66	77		64					
MUL	70	45		80	73							
PAC												
WHT	73	70	56	81	75	55	75					
FRL	48	59	38	64	68	39	56					

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	69	65	52	73	65	26	69					
SWD	28	43		33	38		20					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	64			64								
HSP	59	55		56	45		64					
MUL	61			76								
PAC												
WHT	71	69	57	75	68	36	71					
FRL	55	67	46	60	50	21	54					

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	69	68	40	79	68	48	68					
SWD	29	33	19	46	50	41	27					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	64	80		64	60							
HSP	58	66	33	67	51	50	44					
MUL	77			100								
PAC												
WHT	71	69	42	81	71	47	72					
FRL	57	62	33	69	57	44	55					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

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

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

One data point requiring focus is the 3rd grade ELA proficiency rate of 58%, falling 8 percentage points below the school's achievement level. Another trend that emerged requiring further support is the subgroup, students with disabilities (SWD). In English/Language Arts (ELA) the SWD subgroup are performing below the 41% proficiency rate requiring an ESSA goal. Contributing factors to this data could be a result of staffing shortages as we had numerous support staff positions open for a majority of the school year. These staff members play a vital role in the overall achievement of our students and school.

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

Based on the 2023 FAST results, the greatest need for improvement is in English/Language Arts (ELA) proficiency. Specifically the proficiency of students with disabilities and the L25 quartile. Another point of focus is the third grade cohort at 58% proficiency in ELA which is 8 percentage points below the overall school's ELA achievement level. This decline can be attributed to the staffing shortages that took place during the 2022-2023 school year. Identifying factors within the instructional setting, one mitigating factor can be more focused student-centered instruction and standards-based instruction with rigor.

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.

Oakhurst out-performed both the district and state among all three cells (ELA, Math, and Science).

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

Based on the 2022 to 2023 statewide assessments, the greatest improvement was made in science. Based on the statewide assessments, in 2022, science proficiency was at 71% and in 2023 science proficiency increased to 74%. This three-point percentage increase is an improvement. The cross-curricular approaches supported this endeavor, as did the MAST (Math and Science Teacher Institute) initiative that led targeted PLCs throughout the school year.

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

Further support is the subgroup, students with disabilities (SWD) is a priority for the upcoming school year.

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

1. Third Grade Proficiency Rates in ELA
2. Learning Gains across all subject areas
3. Supporting the continuous growth of students with disabilities

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

:

#1. 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.

Based on the Early Warning Systems collected from the 2022-2023 school year displays 118 students that are absent more than 10% of the time. This Early Warning Indicator can directly impact student achievement, therefore student engagement and positive behavior strategies will be implemented to increase student attendance and decrease other affected early warning indicators.

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

Increase overall student attendance rates and decrease number of students that are absent more than 10% of the time from 118 students to 60, which would take our percentage of students missing more than 10% of school to 10% down from 20%.

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

In order to monitor the desired outcome, the Child Study Team (CST) will meet twice a month to monitor student attendance rates and monitor students with Early Warning Indicators. Necessary steps will be made to reach out to families regarding attendance, including but not limited to phone calls, letters, and celebratory correspondence with attendance rates increase. In addition, data chats and PLCs with instructional staff members will be utilized to measure this desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Positive behavior strategies implemented within the classroom to increase connections and relationships to empower students to increase attendance rates. PLCs among staff members to analyze and disaggregate the data for students with multiple Early Warning Indicators.

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

This strategy was selected to improve student attendance rates and support students with multiple Early Warning Indicators while ultimately increasing the positive learning experience for all 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.

Implement positive behavior support strategies to better support the Tier 1 needs of the school.

Person Responsible: Chelsea Smith (smithchels@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

Student engagement (FAST data, common assessments, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2022-2023 school year displays an increase in students performing below grade in ELA, Math, and Science. The area of focus will remain on strategically focusing on student engagement and experiences while aligning tasks to grade-appropriate benchmarks and providing students with consistent opportunities to be successful.

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

Proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) will increase 14% (from 66% to 80%), as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).
Proficiency in Mathematics will increase 4% (from 76% to 80%), as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).
Proficiency in Science will increase 6% (from 74% to 80%), as measured by the Statewide Science Assessment (SSA).

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

Walk through data, data chats, PLCs, observation feedback and professional development will be utilized to monitor the success of the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Empower teachers as instructional leaders within their classrooms by sharing best practices through co-teaching, opening classrooms for observation, debrief and feedback. Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily with high levels of student engagement and positive student experiences. This work will be supported through curriculum meetings, PLCs, feedback, and/or the use of classroom videos.

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

Gain a deeper understanding of the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks in addition to the FSASS (Florida's State Academic Standards for Science) to increase student outcomes while utilizing student engagement strategies to create a common foundation of rigorous expectations for all 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.

• Collaborative Planning implementing data to drive student-centered instruction
• Structured small group interventions to support students with their specific needs
• Student goal setting with their teacher to monitor and celebrate academic progress
• Increase enriching vocabulary to support students' growth across subject areas
• Intentionally embedding higher-order questioning into lessons
• Design schedules and structures that allow for teachers to open their doors to one another for the purpose of collaboratively studying levels of student engagement and the impacts on literacy outcomes.

Person Responsible: Kelly Kennedy (kennedyke@pcsb.org)

#3. 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.

Benchmark-based data (FAST data, common assessments, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2022-2023 school year displays Students with Disabilities performing below proficiency. The area of focus will remain on consistently aligning tasks to grade-appropriate standards and providing students with consistent opportunities to be successful.

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

Proficiency for Students with Disabilities in ELA will increase to 80%, as measured by the end of the school year progress monitoring tool.

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

Walk through data, data chats, PLCs, observation feedback and professional development will be utilized to monitor the success of the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback and engaging students in rigorous tasks and assignments across all grade levels, and aligning those tasks to B.E.S.T. Benchmarks, will allow students to show growth in all areas.

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

Engaging students with disabilities in grade-level appropriate rigorous tasks that are aligned to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks, will allow students to show growth and reach proficiency. Collaborative planning will support instructional decisions for differentiation strategies to help close gaps in standards acquisition.

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.

Strategically cluster students with disabilities into classrooms based on academic level and IEP goals to best meet the specific needs of the students.
Provide opportunities for ESE and gen ed teachers to co plan for differentiated instruction and support delivery of services.
Utilize metacognitive strategies into content-based instruction to teach students critical memory and engagement strategies they can use to attain and access grade level content.

Utilizing assistive technology to make rigorous text, materials, content, and activities accessible to all students.
Utilize multiple sources of data to design instruction and progress monitoring that aligns with the students' IEP goals.

Person Responsible: Kelly Kennedy (kennedyke@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 school principal, Kelly Kennedy, will oversee all school improvement funding allocations with the input of the school improvement plan committees comprised of staff members in addition to the school advisory council. The input of the stakeholders with ongoing data monitoring will ensure that the resources are allocated based on the needs outlined within the School Improvement Plan.

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

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

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

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

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?

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?

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

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes