Pinellas County Schools

Woodlawn Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Woodlawn Elementary School

1600 16TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33704

http://www.woodlawn-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 Woodlawn Elementary is to establish a respectful learning environment that builds the foundation for scholars to have a successful future through relationships, relevance and rigor.

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
Graham, Vickie	Principal	The principal oversees the daily operation of the entire school. They are in charge of hiring and retention of teachers, promoting a positive school culture and climate for all staff and scholars and ensuring best teaching practices are known and used for improvement of student achievement.
Richards-Betts, Gwendetta	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal supports and leads assigned school teams to increased school and student outcomes through ongoing training, coaching, feedback and support by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing operational, safety and policy responsibilities, as assigned.

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.

Our process for stakeholder involvement in the development of Woodlawn's SIP included:
*Reviewing survey data from the 2022-23 school year (parents, staff & students)
*Input from leadership team & staff goal managers
*Feedback from grade level teams

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))

Besides reviewing the SIP at SAC meetings; we will also monitor the SIP on the fourth Tuesday of every month at SIP committee meetings.

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	77%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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: D 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	5	9	5	6	6	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	15	2	4	3	5	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	15	3	6	3	4	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	15	13	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	20	19	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	5	6	1	5	6	0	0	0	27
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	23	6	14	16	19	0	0	0	78

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	2	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	1	19	10	7	9	5	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	11	13	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	13	18	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	4	1	3	4	6	0	0	0	24

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	2	4	6	1	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	19	10	7	9	5	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	11	13	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	13	18	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	4	1	3	4	6	0	0	0	24

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	2	4	6	1	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	30			25			41		
ELA Learning Gains	53			46			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50			30			70		
Math Achievement*	39			28			48		
Math Learning Gains	33			17			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	8						50		
Science Achievement*	21			26			29		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	50			100			50		

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	284
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

	2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY			
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	14	Yes	1	1
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	28	Yes	3	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	28	Yes	1	1

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	30	53	50	39	33	8	21					50
SWD	4	33		20	13		0					
ELL												50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19	52	60	27	26		10					
HSP	25	40		15	30							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	52	60		70	60							
FRL	23	51	55	28	26	0	12					

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	25	46	30	28	17		26					100
SWD	11	23		12	8		0					
ELL												100
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19	48		22	18		24					
HSP	18			27								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	39			39								
FRL	17	37		21	11		11					

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	41	56	70	48	54	50	29					50
SWD	19	57	82	28	55	53	23					
ELL	30			50								50
AMI												
ASN	60			60								
BLK	23	55	86	30	44	53	10					
HSP	27	45		40	36							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	64	62		70	81							
FRL	36	53	73	44	52	50	24					

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.

Science data showed the lowest performance at 32% proficiency. However, there was an eleven percent point increase from the 2021-22 school year.

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

The data component that has had the greatest decline is Math. In the 2019 school year, math proficiency was 48%. During the 2021 school year, math proficiency was 28%. In the 2022 school year, math proficiency was 39%. During the 2023 school year, math proficiency was 34%.

Factors that contributed to the decline:
*COVID decline
*Lack of number sense
*Lack of fact fluency

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was math. The students at Woodlawn in grades 3 - 5 were 34% proficient in math. The state average was 58%.
Factors that contributed to the gap:
*Lack of number sense
*Lack of conceptual understanding of mathematical concepts

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

Science was the data component that showed the most improvement. The science increased from 21% proficient (2021-2022) to 32% proficient (2022-2023) school year.

*Attending weekly planning sessions
*Reviewing diagnostic data
*Remediated previous taught benchmarks
*Providing nature of science experiences
* Attending science professional development
*Planning standards-based instruction with Science Coach

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

Absent 10% or more days: 51 students
Level 1 on statewide math assessment: 35 students

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

*Increase reading proficiency
*Increase math proficiency
*Decrease absences

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

Data collected from statewide assessment for ELA indicated proficiency levels at 35 % for grades 3 -5. Proficiency levels for Mathematics based on the statewide assessment for grades 3 - 5 are 34 %. Science proficiency score on SSA was 32%. Teachers need to focus lessons on standards and tasks aligned to the standards. Teachers need professional development opportunities to learn effective teaching strategies.

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

The percent of scholars achieving proficiency in ELA will increase from 35% proficient to 50% as measured by the PM3 (FAST) Florida Assessment for Student Thinking.

Grade 3 proficiency will increase from 55% to 70% as measured by the PM3 FAST.

The percent of students achieving Mathematics proficiency will increase from 34% to 50% as measured by the Florida Assessment for Student Thinking for Mathematics. Our level of proficiency for Science was 32% proficient on the Florida Statewide Science Assessment. We expect our level to increase to 40% by May 2024. Based on observations, at least 75% of teachers will have aligned instruction and task to Benchmark standards.

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

Monitoring will occur by administrators conducting classroom visits and providing feedback to teachers. Administrators will attend all PLC's for data discussions and actionable planning. Progress monitoring and data chats will occur by administrators and teachers for school, district, and state assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vickie Graham (grahamv@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.)

Gain a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards and FSASS as a non-negotiable for improving scholar outcomes. Monitor whole group and small group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles. WICOR strategies will be implemented across content areas.

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

Standards-based data (FAST) collected from the 2022-2023 school year showed scholars performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Scholars are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning.

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?

Yes

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.

*Establish structures in PLC's & Collaborative Planning to include the following.
*Become familiar with the design in order to understand what students are expected to master.
*Synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.
*Purposefully combine/stack standards and benchmarks to support learning so that a benchmark is spotlighted and supporting benchmarks (such as ELA Expectations/MTRs) that enhance instruction are incorporated in the lesson to meet the demands of the spotlighted benchmark.
*Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for scholars with exceptional, English Language supports as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above the benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond, small group instruction based on data.

Person Responsible: Vickie Graham (grahamv@pcsb.org)

#2. 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.

Based on 2022 FSA data, the proficiency data for the Economically
Disadvantaged (28%), Students with Disabilities(14%), EL (28%),
and African American (32%) subgroups fell below 41% proficient.

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 proficiency will increase to at least 41% of the students in these subgroups scoring at a level 3 and above on FAST for the 2023-24 school year.

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

SBLT will monitor data student progress utilizing District and State Assessments. Teachers will utilize data in performance matters from standards based assessments to track progress of students in these subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vickie Graham (grahamv@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 ongoing PD for teachers on high yield teaching strategies, AVID, and Restorative
Practices and the 6M's.
2. Data will be reviewed and shared at PLC's to discuss action planning.
3. Administrators/Teachers will conduct walkthroughs for implementation of CRT.

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

In order for scholars to increase proficiency it is imperative that core instruction is implemented utilizing effective strategies that are scholar centered and meet the needs of each and every scholar.

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?

Yes

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.

1. Provide ongoing PD for teachers on culturally relevant teaching routines, AVID, and Restorative Practices and the 6M's.
2. Data will be reviewed and shared at PLC's to discuss action planning.
3. Administrators/Teachers will conduct walkthroughs for implementation of CRT.

Person Responsible: Gwendetta Richards-Betts (richards-bettsg@pcsb.org)

For (SWD) subgroup Scholars will receive instruction in foundational skills necessary to engage in rigorous, grade level content by using evidence based practices. Scholars will receive scaffolded instruction in the general education classroom supported by ESE teachers.

Person Responsible: Gwendetta Richards-Betts (richards-bettsg@pcsb.org)

For EL scholars, we will establish and implement processes that create a system of support. Teachers will plan and deliver instruction that meets the needs of EL students based on English language proficiency levels and the length of time in the U.S. to ensure academic success.

Person Responsible: Gwendetta Richards-Betts (richards-bettsg@pcsb.org)

Additional learning opportunities are provided outside of the school day to broaden background knowledge, schema, vocabulary and experiences. (Economically Disadvantaged)

Person Responsible: Gwendetta Richards-Betts (richards-bettsg@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.

Early warning system was identified as a crucial need as a result of the EWS data:
* 51 students were absent 10% or more days
*39 students scored a level 1 on the math portion of the statewide assessment

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

*Decrease the number of students that were absent 10% or more from 51 students to 20 students
*Decrease the number of students that scored a level 1 on the math portion of the statewide assessment from 39 students to 19 students.

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

The SBLT and CST will monitor attendance data and the number of incentives given biweekly to decrease student absences.

Formative, summative and observational, and FAST math data will be monitored at SBLT (bi-weekly) and PLCS as assessments are completed and the end of unit or benchmark.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gwendetta Richards-Betts (richards-bettsg@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.)

Decrease the number of students that were absent 10% or more from 51 students to 20 students.
*Work with Student Service team
*Child Study Team meetings twice a month
*Behavior incentives
Decrease the number of students that scored a level 1 on the math portion of the statewide assessment from 39 students to 19 students.
* Provide standards-based core instruction
*Address common misconceptions and errors in math
*Provide opportunities for students to work through concrete, representational, and abstract understanding

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

In order to increase math proficiency students, need to be in school to receive the instruction and teachers must provide standards-based instruction. Which includes students having the experiences to work through math problems to develop a deep level on conceptual understanding.

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?

Yes

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 description entered

Person Responsible: Vickie Graham (grahamv@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).

Pinellas County Schools Superintendent and the Pinellas County School Board have invested in a strong support structure that creates an increasing number of strategies and interventions to support schools in need. The district has robust systems, processes, and measures to continually review the progress in the schools in support of their continued improvement. Data review has informed the various aspects of this plan. It connects several ongoing monitoring systems to support the schools in alignment with the domains for school turnaround: Effective Leadership, Collaborative Teaching, Ambitious Instruction and Learning, Safe and Supportive Environment, and Family and Community Engagement. The Leadership Team will continue to meet weekly to monitor the progress of our Differentiated Accountability (DA) schools. Issues identified in the process include but are not limited to the following: teacher concerns, staffing model, technology, facilities, instructional practices, the effectiveness of School-based Leadership Teams, coaching support model, allocation of resources, progress monitoring, and student performance. The team evaluates identified issues weekly and establishes a plan of action to resolve them effectively and efficiently.
The process to review school improvement funding at Woodlawn is reviewed by the content goal managers and team monthly by staff. The budget plan is reviewed also by our Title I office, who offers technical assistance and reviews the budget to ensure spending is focused on school Improvement action steps and resources. Stakeholders such as parents and the community are also afforded an opportunity to review the budget of the SIP is used based on the needs of the school identified in the plan at SAC meetings.

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.

Woodlawn Elementary School will provide information to all stakeholders regarding SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP programs in a timely manner using various methods of communication including meetings, letters home, Class Dojo, emails and the school website. During the Annual Title I Meeting and SAC meetings information about Title I programs, curriculum, and academic assessments will be shared. Up-

to-date information will also be kept at the "Parent Station" located in the front office for parent convenience.

https://www.pcsb.org/woodlawn-es

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))

Woodlawn Elementary School seeks to provide excellent customer service and availability for parents. The administrators make themselves available to parents to the largest degree possible when parents come to the school with questions or concerns. We offer evening events throughout the year. We video our schoolwide meetings and celebrations to share virtually with all families on Class Dojo.

Report cards, Midterm progress reports
Take home folders
Class newsletters
School messenger
Social Media postings

https://www.pcsb.org/woodlawn-es

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))

One of Woodlawn's area of Focus is: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction.
Our measurable outcomes for this goal are:
*The percent of scholars achieving proficiency in ELA will increase from 35% to 45% as measured by the (FAST) Florida Assessment for Student Thinking.
*The percent of students achieving Mathematics proficiency will increase from 34% to 45% as measured by the Florida Assessment for Student Thinking for Mathematics.
*Our level of proficiency for Science was 32% proficient on the Florida Statewide Science Assessment. We expect our level to increase to 40% by May 2024.
Based on observations, at least 75% of teachers will have aligned instruction and task to Benchmark standards.

We will achieve these measurable outcomes by:
School leadership team will strengthen the academic program at Woodlawn by creating a master schedule that reflects bell to bell instruction, analyzing data at weekly PLCs, collaborative planning sessions with district/TZ coaches and school leadership, onsite and district content professional development, and a promise time program that includes remediation and enrichment.

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

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				$42,623.49
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.43	$24,471.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/other certified: The instructional staff developer (ISD), multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) coach will support teachers 1) in planning and aligning classroom plans to district and state standards, 2) analyzing, monitoring, and communicating response to instruction/intervention data, 3) monitoring schoolwide achievement data, and 4) monitoring behavior data as a member of the school based leadership team (SBLT), identifying students not responding to Tier I supports, and coaching teachers on implementing Tier II supports.			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,507.49
			Notes: Instructional, basic/supplies: Materials and supplies supporting instructional delivery such as intervention kits at multiple levels, math supplies and manipulatives, and workbooks.			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.43	$3,321.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/retirement: ISD MTSS teacher retirement contribution (13.57%).			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.43	$1,872.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): ISD MTSS teacher FICA taxes (7.65%).			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.43	$5,695.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/group insurance: ISD MTSS teacher group insurance (average $13,245).			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.07	$3,984.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/classroom teacher: The ISD MTSS position will teach one class focusing on small group intervention for students needing additional intervention to close the learning gap. The ISD's class will present instructional practices in a model/demonstration classroom setting for observation by all math and reading instructors.			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.07	$541.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/retirement: ISD MTSS teacher retirement contribution (13.57%).			

			Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.07	$305.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): ISD MTSS teacher FICA taxes (7.65%).			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.07	$927.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/group insurance. ISD MTSS teacher group insurance (average $13,245).			
2	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**				**$73,975.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.43	$24,471.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/other certified: The instructional staff developer (ISD), multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) coach will support teachers 1) in planning and aligning classroom plans to district and state standards, 2) analyzing, monitoring, and communicating response to instruction/intervention data, 3) monitoring schoolwide achievement data, and 4) monitoring behavior data as a member of the school based leadership team (SBLT), identifying students not responding to Tier I supports, and coaching teachers on implementing Tier II supports.			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.43	$3,321.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/retirement: ISD MTSS teacher retirement contribution (13.57%).			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.43	$1,872.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): ISD MTSS teacher FICA taxes (7.65%).			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.43	$5,695.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/group insurance: ISD MTSS teacher group insurance (average $13,245).			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.72	$20,400.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/classroom teacher: The part time hourly reading recovery teacher will be scheduled to work 5 hours per day, 5 days per week. This teacher will use researched based strategies and interventions to support enrichment and/or reteaching of content, assisting with individual or small group instruction, assisting with administering diagnostics and assessments, and planning support based on assessment results.			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.72	$2,768.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/retirement: PTH teacher retirement contribution (13.57%).			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.72	$1,561.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): PTH teacher FICA taxes (7.65%).			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG		$6,130.00
			Notes: Instructional Staff training: Innovative Schools Summit (PBIS, Discipline, Trauma Impacted Students) in Nashville, TN 6/19-23/2024. Registration $545, airfare $500, lodging $1,375 ($275/night x 5 nights), meals $320 ($64/day x 5 days), mileage/parking $325 = $3,065 per attendee x 2 attendees = $6,130.00,			

			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG		$2,000.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/travel: Attendance by two staff members at the 2024 BSI summer conference. Estimated costs include lodging $600 ($200/night x 3 nights), food $192 ($62 x 3 days), and mileage/parking $208. Total cost per attendee = $1,000 x 2 attendees = $2,000.			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.07	$3,984.00
			Notes: "Instruction, basic/classroom teacher: The ISD MTSS position will teach one class focusing on small group intervention for students needing additional intervention to close the learning gap. The ISD's class will present instructional practices in a model/ demonstration classroom setting for observation by all instructors.			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.07	$541.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/retirement: ISD MTSS teacher retirement contribution (13.57%).			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.07	$305.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): ISD MTSS FICA taxes (7.65%).			
			4931 - Woodlawn Elementary School	UniSIG	0.07	$927.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/group insurance. ISD MTSS teacher group insurance (average $13,245).			
3	III.B.	**Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$121,837.50**

Budget Approval

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

Yes