Sutherland Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sutherland Elementary School

3150 N BELCHER RD, Palm Harbor, FL 34683

http://www.sutherland-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 Sutherland family works together to provide a successful, quality education in a safe learning environment to prepare each student for college, career and life.

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
Cantu, Kristy	Principal	The duties include but are not limited to promoting and maintaining high student achievement by shaping a vision of academic success for all students, providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school operations, ensuring a safe learning environment, cultivating leadership in others and maintaining a school climate that is supportive to the needs of staff, students and families
Hurton, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring.
Salzer, Alexis	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional support and data monitoring
Bengston, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional supports and data monitoring.
Conforti-Friedman, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional supports and data monitoring.
Napier, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional supports and data monitoring.
Sparkman, Aimee	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional supports and data monitoring.
Grandmaison, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional supports and data monitoring.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ingle, Olga	Teacher, K-12	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional supports and data monitoring.
Phillips, Tisha	Teacher, ESE	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional supports and data monitoring.
Simms, Yevodkia	Administrative Support	Assists in monitoring action steps in our SIP, reviews school wide data, supports initiatives, part of decision making team with respect to school wide initiatives, instructional supports and data monitoring.

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.

We utilize our School Advisory Council which is comprised of school staff to include instructional and support members, parents and our community leader through the Palm Harbor Library. Draft goals and action steps are developed with school teams through PLC's, and SIP work teams as well as with our entire SAC to include families and community leaders. A thorough review of data relevant to all goal areas drives the work in developing targets and corresponding action steps. After the draft plan is developed, goals and action steps are adjusted based on the feedback of our SAC prior to the final vote on the plan.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP is monitored after each of our district assessment cycles to measure student performance trends in meeting our goals. We also review sections of our SIP either through grade level PLC's or through our site-embedded professional development. Through the work with our School Based Leadership team we progress monitor students in all subgroups with the largest achievement gaps to determine if interventions are having a positive impact on student learning and the achievement gap is closing. A mid-year reflection and 90 day action plan are also developed to address any identified deficiencies and revise our plan as needed. Potential revisions to the plan are reviewed after each district assessment cycle, as well as after each grading period.

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	43%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	*Data will be uploaded when available*
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2020-21: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	15	10	10	14	6	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	23	8	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	3	0	0	0	21
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	8	4	0	0	0	12

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	5	8	0	5	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	10	12	7	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	6	4	0	0	0	25
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	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	5	8	0	5	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	10	12	7	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	6	4	0	0	0	25
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	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
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*	65			70			78		
ELA Learning Gains	66			75			73		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49			74			59		
Math Achievement*	82			80			86		
Math Learning Gains	85			90			89		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	76			89			83		
Science Achievement*	73			83			80		

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	52			52			92		

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	548
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	54			
ELL	57			
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	46			
HSP	69			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	65			

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	65	66	49	82	85	76	73					52
SWD	30	43		70	71							
ELL	47	44		70	72							52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			42								
HSP	58	67		68	86		67					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	66	66	48	86	83	65	80					56
FRL	52	60	50	76	87	79	59					58

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	70	75	74	80	90	89	83					52
SWD	36	40		68	80							
ELL	64	77		86	92		77					52

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			60								
HSP	56			67								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	74	73	75	82	89	88	81					60
FRL	58	73	67	75	95	83	78					50

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	78	73	59	86	89	83	80					92
SWD	66	74		79	84	83						
ELL	63	63	58	81	78							92
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	76	62		85	95	91	70					
MUL	73			91								
PAC												
WHT	79	75	65	86	88	81	81					93
FRL	70	71	54	81	86	81	81					94

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.

Through analysis of our data our 3rd grade ELA proficiency was the lowest performing. Historically we have seen 3rd grade performance fall behind other grade levels which caused us to dig a little deeper into this trend. Some of the contributing factors include the lack of high expectations in grade 2. Tasks need to be more aligned to grade level standards with an increase in rigor in grade 2 and grade 3. Student independence also needs to increase for stamina to build. The mindset of teachers in grades 2 and 3 needs to shift to believe that students can work to a higher potential and plan for higher level questioning during instruction and small group. It was the first year rolling out the B.E.S.T. standards, in addition to a new reading curriculum. Teachers continue to build understanding of the science of reading and how that is integrated into instruction.
ELA phonics instructional routines (Fun with Phonics) were not formally in place when current 3rd, 4th & 5th grade students were in primary grades.

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

Science proficiency is flatlining.
Science instructional time is when students are pulled for ESE services and 4th & 5th grade students are pulled for chorus. Essentially a child receiving Speech services and in chorus could miss 3 instructional days of science. When more instructional time is needed in reading & math, science instructional minutes often get cut in other grade levels which causes a stacking effect when they get to 5th grade. Teachers need understand vertical progression of science standards.
The lack of a spiraling curriculum, as well as a cumulative assessment in all grade levels contributes to this lack of progress.
Our ESE and ELL students were the majority of our Level 1 and 2 scores indicating that we need to shift our focus to support those subgroups in the area of Science. Working with our ELL and ESE teachers to infuse Science content into their support will be a focus.

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.

In looking at the gap (closest to the state average represented by a smaller number) 3rd grad ELA only had an 11 point difference (61%) compared to the state average (50%). The factors that contribute to this are the same as those that were stated above. Historically we have seen 3rd grade performance fall behind other grade levels which caused us to dig a little deeper into this trend. Some of the contributing factors include the lack of high expectations in grade 2. Tasks need to be more aligned to grade level standards with an increase in rigor in grade 2 and grade 3. Student independence also needs to increase for stamina to build. The mindset of teachers in grades 2 and 3 needs to shift to believe that students can work to a higher potential and plan for higher level questioning during instruction and small group. It was the first year rolling out the B.E.S.T. standards, in addition to a new reading curriculum. Teachers continue to build understanding of the science of reading and how that is integrated into instruction.
ELA phonics instructional routines (Fun with Phonics) were not formally in place when current 3rd, 4th & 5th grade students were in primary grades.

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

Our most improved area was in 4th grade ELA proficiency. This increase was a direct result of a change in the planning process for ELA. Teachers continued to collaboratively plan, however they shifted their focus to pure standards based planning. Through their consistent analysis, they found that implementing the ELA modules as they are written did not yield the best results in moving students to proficiency. They pulled apart the modules and utilized the standards to build student knowledge. They also used formative assessment on a daily basis to measure student understanding and shift instruction as needed.

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

In reflecting on our EWS data, attendance continues to be an area of concern. Even through consistent problem solving we have not seen a significant decrease in the number of students missing 10% of school or more.

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

1) Increase proficiency in ELA proficiency to 80% or above
2.) Increase Science proficiency to 80% or above
3) Learning gains for L35 in ELA

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.

As our Child Study Team met bi-weekly to monitor student attendance we continued to have more than 10% of our students absent 10% or more in first and 2nd grade. The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because primary families do not believe that there is a great impact to learning if the child misses school at that level. This in part because the grading system utilizes a different coding system in primary grades. If structures addressing having consistent attendance are implemented, with a focus in grades 1 and 2, the problem would be reduced as evidenced by a decrease in the number of students missing 10% of school or more.

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

We expect the number of students missing 10% of school or more in Grades 1 and 2 to decrease by 50% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored using the following:
~Daily attendance data
~Child Study Team review of problem solving implementation and outcome

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristy Cantu (cantuk@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.)

~Strengthen the ability of classroom teachers and supporting staff to establish and maintain a positive relationship with students and families
~Create consistent and predictable environments where expectations are explicit so that the whole school community knows how to be successful
~

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

By establishing and maintaining positive relationships with all students and families, students will feel more connected to their classrooms. When expectations for attendance and the importance of consistent attendance are explicitly shared with families in the primary grades a greater effort will be made to ensure students are in school daily.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Create messaging to be shared with all families in the primary grades regarding expectations for attendance.

Person Responsible: Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Implementation of before/after school clubs that are meaningful to students to encourage consistent daily attendance.

Person Responsible: Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Develop an attendance tracker that students can use to monitor their own attendance with various incentive tiers connected to improved attendance

Person Responsible: Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Meet with families of students who are chronically absent to individually problem solve and help remove barriers

Person Responsible: Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Create a process to match students who are chronically absent with a trusted adult/mentor.

Person Responsible: Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to
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.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention: Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Tier of Evidence-based Intervention (Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. 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.

Standards-based data (FAST, Report Card) collected and reviewed from the 2022-2023 school year showed gaps in performance (proficiency measures) in all content areas. After careful discussion and analysis of the data it was determined that students are not being provided the opportunity to respond to questions that require deeper thinking and that we remain rooted in Level 1 and Level 2 questions/tasks no matter the standard. There continues to be a lack of consistency in tasks/questions aligned to grade appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks and higher level questioning.
Our current level of performance in ELA is 68% as measured by the 2023 FAST
Our current level of performance in Math is 80% as measured by the 2023 FAST
Our current level of performance in Science is 73% as measured by the 2023 NGSSS

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

The percentage of students achieving ELA proficiency of Level 3 or higher will be 80%
The percentage of students achieving Math proficiency of Level 3 or higher will be 90%
The percentage of students achieving Science proficiency of Level 3 or higher will be 85%
Black student proficiency in ELA/Math/Science will increase 10% as measured by the 2023 FAST

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored in the following way:
~Administrative walk-through and observation data
~MTSS Review of Progress Monitoring Tools
~Grade level data reviews
~Quarterly Report Card Data
~FAST assessments after each cycle completion

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristy Cantu (cantuk@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.)

Teachers will gain a deeper understanding on how to plan and deliver lessons aligned to the BEST standards to include criteria to push "elevate" questioning techniques, as well as align robust, rigorous tasks aligned to the standards.

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

Students will increase proficiency when they are given the opportunity to respond to questions that go beyond the lower level of Webb's Depth of Knowledge to raise rigor, as well as complete independent tasks that are tightly aligned to the rigor of the standards. With our current structures which include ELA Champions, peer coaches across content areas and systematic timely and actionable feedback, a culture of professional growth in our targeted areas will yield positive 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.

Become familiar with the design in order to understand what students are expected to master

Person Responsible: Kimberly Hurton (hurtonk@pcsb.org)

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

Person Responsible: Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Teachers and administrators employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to: positive expectations for success; meaningful tasks related to student interests and cultural backgrounds; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals and make choices

Person Responsible: Kimberly Hurton (hurtonk@pcsb.org)

Pre-test students in order to appropriately differentiate with leveled and tiered questions and/or tasks.

Person Responsible: Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Utilize Depth and Complexity Framework during collaborative planning

Person Responsible: Kimberly Hurton (hurtonk@pcsb.org)

Teachers will engage in site-based and/or district provided professional development that is content-focused, teacher and student focused, instructionally relevant and actionable related to higher level questioning and task alignment

Person Responsible: Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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.

Standards-based data (FAST, Report Card) collected and reviewed from the 2022-2023 school year showed gaps in performance in all content areas as it relates to our Gifted population. After careful discussion and analysis of the data, it was determined that our teachers need support in planning for differentiation of our higher performing students.

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

The percentage of students identified as Gifted achieving a proficiency level of 5 in ELA, Math and Science will increase to 85% as measured by the 2023-2024 FAST and state Science assessment.

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored the following way:
~Grade level data reviews
~Quarterly Report Card grades
~FAST data after the completion of each assessment cycle
~Administrative walk-through and observation data
~Progress monitoring of EP goals

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristy Cantu (cantuk@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.)

Teachers will gain a deeper understanding of how to plan and deliver lessons that meet the needs of the gifted and talented learners by differentiating regularly.

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

Differentiation consists of the efforts of the teachers to respond to variance among learners in the classroom. Students identified as Gifted will increase proficiency to a Level 5 when they are given the opportunity to respond to tasks and questions that are aligned to their current instructional level. Whenever a teacher reaches out to an individual or small group to vary teaching in order to create the best learning experience possible, the student benefits as it stretches their current depth of knowledge.

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.

Cluster group gifted and talented students so that the process of engaging students in complex, differentiated tasks occurs easily and frequently

Person Responsible: Kimberly Hurton (hurtonk@pcsb.org)

Utilize the Depth and Complexity framework

Person Responsible: Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Pre-test students in general education classroom in order to appropriately differentiate with leveled or tiered questions, objectives or assignments

Person Responsible: Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Gifted teacher to collaboratively plan with grade level teachers to build instructional capacity

Person Responsible: Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)

Incorporate project based learning for unit/module in the general education classroom.

Person Responsible: Kristy Cantu (cantuk@pcsb.org)