
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	11
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Seventy Fourth St. Elementary

3801 74TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33709

<http://www.74th-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Donna Gehringer A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2019

2018-19 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: D 2013-14: F
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of 74th Street Elementary is to set high expectations and celebrate student success in our community of learners to create an environment of maximum student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement

100% Student Success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Hathaway, Jessley	Principal
Principal	
Wyne, Kurt	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Ovalle, Jennifer	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Brodney, Sandy	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Goede , Caitlin	Teacher, K-12
Teacher, K-12	
Bachnik, Jennifer	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
Patterson, Anna	Other
Other	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	54	74	69	92	61	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	428
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	14	16	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	8	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	5	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

33

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/22/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
-----------	-------------	-------

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	21	22	22	28	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	9	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	26	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	0	17	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	40%	54%	57%	45%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	59%	58%	49%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	54%	53%	44%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	43%	61%	63%	46%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	41%	61%	62%	35%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	48%	51%	37%	42%	47%
Science Achievement	39%	53%	53%	34%	57%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	54 (0)	74 (0)	69 (0)	92 (0)	61 (0)	78 (0)	428 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	13 ()	14 ()	16 ()	7 ()	9 ()	59 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	2 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	11 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)	17 (0)	26 (0)	52 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	34%	56%	-22%	58%	-24%
	2018	45%	53%	-8%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	56%	-4%	58%	-6%
	2018	42%	51%	-9%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
	2018	42%	50%	-8%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	37%	62%	-25%	62%	-25%
	2018	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-25%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	64%	-13%	64%	-13%
	2018	46%	62%	-16%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	45%	60%	-15%	60%	-15%
	2018	28%	61%	-33%	61%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	53%	-15%
	2018	35%	57%	-22%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data											
2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	14	37	50	25	30	27					
ELL	26	44		43	36		21				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
ASN	60	70		67	60						
BLK	24	52	40	32	28		23				
HSP	35	56	50	41	38		30				
MUL	67	50		57	50						
WHT	41	55	53	42	43	37	43				
FRL	38	56	55	39	37	36	38				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	13	34	43	25	33	44	15				
ELL	28	52		49	33		31				
ASN	60			67							
BLK	36	33		47	40		14				
HSP	35	44	62	46	41	40	28				
MUL	47	42		42	8						
WHT	49	56	56	44	32	45	43				
FRL	44	49	46	41	33	39	29				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	363
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	64
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our lowest performance cell was our L25 math students. This has been a trend the last three years.

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

ELA proficiency dropped 5 points from the previous year. Third grade proficiency scores dropped 11 points impacting the overall proficiency score for the 18/19 school year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

We are 20 points away from the state average in math proficiency and 21 points away from math learning gains. There are definite gaps in our math instruction.

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

There was a 6 point increase in ELA learning gains. There was a strong focus on ELA Tier 1 instruction across all grade levels.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance is an issue and an area concern. If a student is not in class they are not going to make the expected gains.

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

1. Math Tier 1 Instruction and Learning Gains
2. ELA Tier 1 Instruction and Learning Gains
3. Number of Level 1 students in 3rd, 4th and 5th
4. Attendance
5. Bridging the Achievement Gap

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	English/Language Arts
Rationale	Trend data for ELA proficiency has plateaued, while minimal increases are seen in learning gains and L25 gains. Through the use of Title 1 funding we have purchased an MTSS Coach and hourly teachers to focus on our intervention block, specifically working with our L25 students in 4th and 5th grades.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percentage of students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 40% to 57%, as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Regularly assess (formally and informally) and analyze data in the PLCs to inform instruction in whole group, small group, as well as one-to-one instruction. Continue use of coaching cycle in ELA for identified teachers and grade levels. Facilitate ELA-focused, consistent and sustained professional development with a focus on standards-based instruction, target and task alignment, and the 3 ELA shifts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Assessment data can be used to drive whole class, small group and individual student instruction. If students are not working on grade level tasks, and reading grade level text, they will not be able to perform at the depth of the standard.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborative planning focusing on tier 1 instruction. 2. Instructional rounds providing feedback from administration and ILT. 3. Clearly defined interventions used during tiers 2 and 3. 4. Weekly professional development, conducted through PLCs focusing on high-yield strategies, monitored with feedback during daily walk-throughs. 5. Task alignment to the standards monitored and evidenced through rigorous student work.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Ovalle (ovallej@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Mathematics
Rationale	<p>Downward or flat trend noted in math proficiency and gains. We are being outperformed by like schools in the area of mathematics.</p> <p>This year, using Title 1 funding, we purchased a highly effective .5 math coach to work with our teachers on target task alignment, number routines, and problem solving. Coaching will happen across all grade levels but will primarily focus in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades as we identify and work with L25 students.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>The percentage of all students achieving math proficiency will increase from 43% to 57%, as measured by FSA.</p> <p>The percentage of all students showing learning gains in math will increase from 41% to 60%, as measured by FSA.</p> <p>The percentage of all L25 students showing learning gains in math will increase from 32% to 55%, as measured by FSA.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, and Number Routines. Support this work through curriculum meetings, PLCs, feedback and/or the use of classroom video.</p> <p>Empower mathematics teacher leaders to create and sustain a culture of feedback and openness, including ongoing teacher to teacher feedback, learning walks, using the Coached Observation Protocol.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Research based instructional strategies will have the most impact. Coached Observation Protocol is a powerful part of MLTI training for this year.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ILT will facilitate collaborative planning focused on tier 1 standards-based instruction (attend collaborative planning hubs). 2. Define math interventions and provide professional development on resources inside the building. 3. Develop ongoing professional development that includes teacher leaders. For example, fishbowls. 4. Use Ready Math, MAP data, and unit assessment data to determine individual student needs. 5. Utilize district resources with focused professional development. (Ready Math and Dreambox)
Person Responsible	Sandy Brodney (brodneys@pcsb.org)

#3**Title**

Science

Rationale

Trend data for science is relatively flat and aligns with 5th grade ELA data. Our current level of performance is 39%. This is because the depth of knowledge of standards and the varying use of high yield strategies is not occurring on a regular basis.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

The percentage of all students achieving science proficiency will increase from 38% to 57%, as measured by SSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Assessment data can be used to drive whole class, small group and individual student instruction.

Action Step**Description**

1. Science text incorporated into tier one instruction across all grade levels.
2. Science text used during ELA intervention block.
3. Revisit standards fourth grade students missed.
4. Data chats centered on cycle 3 and cycle 1 assessment data.
5. Pre-school visit during PLCs resources inside Science Gateway.
6. Monitor use of science lab.

Person Responsible

Kurt Wyne (wynek@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Bridging the Gap Plan (Black Student Achievement)
Rationale	There was a 12% point drop in ELA from the previous year with our black students. There was an 8% drop from the previous year with our white students. Both are disappointing, but we must close the gap as there is a 17% difference between white students and black students.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percentage of black students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 24% to 41%, as measured by ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementing culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as oral language, storytelling, cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, morning meetings, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of lesson plans in order to increase the percentage of black students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We are committed to culturally relevant curriculum and engaging instruction in all classrooms. We will demonstrate this through the use of AVID strategies as well as culturally relevant teaching.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ILT provides feedback that is actionable and targeted on equity based strategies. 2. Embedded time during PLCs to visit classrooms and observe culturally relevant instruction. 3. Implement AVID/CRT strategies school wide. 4. Align deliberate practice plans with professional development that address areas of need based on school grade level data.
Person Responsible	Caitlin Goede (goedec@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	School Climate/Conditions for Learning
Rationale	We had 88 referrals last year but well over 1000 office phone calls for behavior support. That is far too many calls for support.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of all students receiving referrals will decrease from 88 to 50, as measured by discipline referral data. Office calls for support will decrease by 80%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kurt Wyne (wynek@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The use of PBIS framework to change the focus of negative consequences for breaking rules to positive rewards for following the rules.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	PBIS is an approach for teaching appropriate behavior and developing a school's social culture. With PBIS, along with restorative practice training, we will focus on positive reinforcement and increasing levels of rewards and consequences.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set clear school-wide social expectations. 2. Acknowledge and reinforce positive behavior. 3. Consistent consequences for problem behaviors. 4. Collection and review of behavior data to drive decision making. 5. Create a Foundations Team comprised of Instructional and Support Staff to determine behavior management system and PBIS.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Bachnik (wassel-bachnikj@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Attendance is a significant problem in the school. Approximately 20% of our student population missed 10% or more of the school year. This is an improvement over the past year.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percentage of all students, who are missing no more than 10% of school, will increase from 20% to 12%, as measured by attendance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Student self-monitoring with incentives for improved attendance. We will also use PBIS strategies to motivate students and parents to attend school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Chronic absenteeism puts students at a great er risk of falling behind during their academic career, especially in the area of literacy. Students reading at grade level in 3rd grade are four times more likely to graduate high school and pursue post graduate education.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement PBIS strategies making school a priority. 2. Child Study Team will provide support to families that have high absenteeism. 3. Student recognition during Awards Ceremony. 4. Social Worker will provide support to families that have high absenteeism. 5. Member of Child Study team will call parent if a student shows a pattern of absenteeism during the first quarter of the school year.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#7	
Title	Healthy Schools
Rationale	Our current level of performance is bronze as evidenced in Alliance for a Healthier Generation.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	74th Street Elementary earned the Bronze Award and our target is the Silver Award.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kurt Wyne (wynek@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Through our healthy schools program, we have adopted policies and practices that empower the entire school community to move more, eat better, and develop healthy habits.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Everyone deserves a healthy future. We must empower everyone to make good choices as it relates to their health.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Offer healthy breakfast and lunch to all students. 2. Complete healthy schools program assessment. 3. Offer 150 minutes of physical education weekly. 4. 20 minutes of recess daily. 5. Professional development for staff focused on health related activities.
Person Responsible	Anna Patterson (pattersona@pcsb.org)

#8	
Title	ESSA Subgroup-Students with Disabilities
Rationale	Negligible increase in proficiency compared to last year, but slight increase in overall gains and greatest increase in L25. ELA deficiency could be the reason for no students proficient in science.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our overall proficiency data was 26%. Our goal will be 51%. The percentage of ESE students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 14% to 41%, as measured by ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessley Hathaway (hathawayj@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will use a push-in and/or inclusion model for our VE Resource students. They will have the same access to the same grade level text as Gen Ed students. They will be required to perform the same tasks with supports noted in their IEP.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Statistics show that ESE students can perform on grade level when presented with grade level materials and resources. We fully expect that, with supports, our students will close the gap this year.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate planning with ESE teachers and Gen Ed teachers led by instructional coaches. 2. Inclusive scheduling to the maximum extent possible. 3. Make sure the interventions for ESE are research-based curriculum measures. 4. All students will have access to grade level text. 5. ILT will monitor data and instructional practices taking place with our ESE students.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Ovalle (ovallej@pcsb.org)

#9	
Title	ESSA Subgroup-English Language Learners
Rationale	Decrease in gains and proficiency compared to last year. ELA deficiency could be the reason for low proficiency in science.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percentage of ELL students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 28% to 40%, as measured by ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Classroom teachers will collaborate with the ESOL teacher to plan and deliver instruction to their EL students aligned with their language proficiency levels. The EL instruction and activities will be based on grade level standards and will include language objectives that will support their English language development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If teachers provide EL students with rigorous lessons that are aligned to on-grade level standards and instruction and are aligned to their English language abilities, the gap will be reduced by at least 10%.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize Ellevation to obtain students' length of time in US schools and language proficiency levels; provide this data to teachers so they can plan effective instruction 2. Provide learning opportunities for teachers on the use of WIDA Ellevation reports and Can Do Approach to support differentiated planning and instruction, based on student language proficiency levels 3. Utilize and monitor the implementation of Can Do Descriptors and Model Performance Indicators in the planning and practice within all classrooms to ensure instruction matches the needs of ELs and scaffolding provides and appropriate entry-point for grade-level content with ongoing support. 4. Administrators will monitor the lesson planning and classroom implementation of effective lessons to engage ELs in rigorous, standards-based work rich in language development. They will utilize the Marzano Focus Model Go To Strategies for English Language Learners document to provide ongoing feedback to teachers to support development of their practice in supporting ELs. 5. Develop a plan to monitor the LF student performance 6. Create a schedule for the Bilingual Assistant that directly supports standards-based instruction for ELs; provide appropriate PD first. 7. Have a school plan for meaningful communication with families via the website, newsletter, parent letters, phone calls, etc. and ensure communication is available in languages spoken by ELs; utilize LionBridge interpretation phone services

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

School Based Leadership Team and Instructional Leadership Team will monitor other school-wide improvement initiatives.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: English/Language Arts				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	School Improvement Funds		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: We will use SIP funds to support our initiatives in ELA focusing on learning gains and African American students.</i>			
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Mathematics				\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Science				\$0.00
4	III.A	Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap Plan (Black Student Achievement)				\$0.00
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: School Climate/Conditions for Learning				\$0.00
6	III.A	Areas of Focus: Attendance				\$0.00
7	III.A	Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools				\$0.00
8	III.A	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup-Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
9	III.A	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup-English Language Learners				\$0.00
					Total:	\$0.00