

Pinellas County Schools

Forest Lakes Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Forest Lakes Elementary School

301 PINE AVE N, Oldsmar, FL 34677

<http://www.forestlks-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.

100% Student Success

Provide the school's vision statement.

Forest Lakes Elementary School—A Community in Pursuit of Highest Student Achievement

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
Huey, Holly	Principal	Develop and monitor areas of focus for school improvement plan. Work with staff to determine strategies and action step to achieve goals set in school improvement plan. Schedule agenda items for faculty meetings, SIP meetings, priority meetings, and PLCs as well as determine needs for professional development.
McClister, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Assists principal in implementing all strategies and action steps laid out in school improvement plan.

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.

Invited staff to meet during summer to review data and develop SIP goals and action steps. Present plan to staff during preschool meeting to review goals and action steps. Adjust as needed based on feedback from staff. Present plan to SAC after review from staff and adjust as needed based on feedback.

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))

SBLT will meet by weekly. Part of SBLT meetings is to track the data of all students and determine next steps based on data. Bi-weekly student services meetings are held to track the data of students who have the greatest gaps. Minutes will show the tracking of the student's behavior and academic

performance. Teams will meet weekly in PLC to review data from classroom formatives and summative assessments and will reflect on progress of goals set by team. Each grading period and testing cycle we will review data as a whole staff and will adjust goals/action steps as needed.

Demographic Data

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	8	15	14	15	13	0	0	0	65	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	17	14	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	6	0	0	0	12	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	2	7	5	5	2	0	0	0	26	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	7	9	0	0	0	18

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	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) 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	16	18	19	18	18	0	0	0	90	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	3	6	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	4	7	0	0	0	26	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	10	4	1	4	0	0	0	26	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	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	1	16	18	19	18	18	0	0	0	90	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	3	6	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	4	7	0	0	0	26	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	10	4	1	4	0	0	0	26	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	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.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	70	55	56	69	54	57
ELA Learning Gains	69	62	61	60	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58	55	52	39	54	53
Math Achievement*	70	62	60	74	61	63
Math Learning Gains	81	65	64	63	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70	54	55	41	48	51
Science Achievement*	65	57	51	66	53	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	68			37		

** 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	551
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

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	49			
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	67			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	62			

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	70	69	58	70	81	70	65					68
SWD	37	63		43	67		33					
ELL	64	73		50	93							68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	56	36		47	67		18					
HSP	61	71		54	88		55					73
MUL												
PAC												

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
WHT	73	70	65	77	81	67	78					
FRL	61	60	50	63	76	67	47					69

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	72	64	28	72	75	47	70					58
SWD	35	33		44	50		36					
ELL	35			55								58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	68			63								
HSP	53	47	27	62	74		50					53
MUL	92			67								
PAC												
WHT	78	70		78	80		78					60
FRL	61	44	17	65	67		50					53

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	69	60	39	74	63	41	66					37
SWD	36	33	29	35	33	33	42					
ELL	50	71		56	40							37
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57			71								
HSP	66	66		67	58	38	50					27
MUL	88	82		88	67							
PAC												
WHT	70	58	35	76	65	48	65					
FRL	60	63	52	65	55	43	64					31

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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	77%	57%	20%	54%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	58%	19%	58%	19%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	53%	5%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	76%	62%	14%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	66%	8%	61%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	61%	14%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	69%	60%	9%	51%	18%

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.

Third grade reading showed a decline in proficiency scores. 58% of students were proficient which was 19% below grades 4 and 5 and a decline of 4% from the year prior. Three new teachers to third grade (one on leave during the year) along with a new standards and testing platform contributed to the decline and lower proficiency in 3rd grade.

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

Third grade reading showed a decline of 4% in proficiency scores. Three new teachers to third grade (one on leave during the year) along with a new standards and testing platform contributed to the decline and lower proficiency in 3rd grade. Additional factors are the increased number of students who are coming to third grade below grade level reading expectations.

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.

All grade level data was above the state average for proficiency, except for SWD. Many students made growth throughout the year, however were not proficient at the grade level standards. Factors may be manifestations of their disabilities and the need for additional progress monitoring and adjusted goals to assure students are progressing toward meeting the grade level standards.

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

Third grade math showed the greatest improvement with 17% increase in proficiency. A focus on the effective tools for the intervention block supported students closing the gap. Strong standard-based instruction with data-driven interventions being provided contributed to the increase.

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

The number of students who had 2 or more early warning signs doubled from the year prior. Many students with level 1 state scores are also absent 10% or more of the year. Working as a CST team this year to develop stronger interventions and tracking for those students will be needed to improve student achievement.

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

Early literacy(K-2) is a priority to increase third grade reading proficiency
 Third grade reading proficiency
 Increase proficiency in reading and math for SWD

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 ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Standards-based data (FSA, unit assessments, etc.) collected from 2022-2023 school year showed an increase in grade level proficiency in ELA. Thirty percent of students across grades 3-5 are performing below grade level in reading and need standards-based instruction that meets the depth of the standard and interventions to fill gaps based on their individual needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency in ELA will increase 5% from 71% to 76% as measured by end of the year FAST assessments.

Proficiency in 3rd Grade ELA will increase 12% from 58% to 70% as measured by end of the year FAST assessments.

Monitoring:

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

PM1 and PM2 along with unit assessments will be used to progress monitor student progress toward proficiency throughout the year. Data chats around grade level and individual students will be held after each cycle.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Huey (hueyh@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.)

Strategically focus on whole group and small group instruction in the K-3 classrooms to ensure explicit and systematic instruction is targeted to the needs of the students. Provide additional supports, school based professional development, and coaching/feedback to increase teacher content knowledge in the science of reading and instructional routines to improve student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To develop literacy skills, students need instruction in foundational reading skills and reading comprehension skills. Using assessment data to align and target specific skills during intervention periods as well as focus on the use of high-yield routines during core instruction will allow all students to progress to mastery of grade level benchmarks.

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.

Use state and district resources to better understand the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Provide regular structures for planning where teachers regularly engage in data/student work analysis and lesson planning for scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with special needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions for students above benchmark.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: October

Implement a plan for tracking students not meeting the benchmark in K-3 grade, including the intervention being provided, and frequently monitoring progress. Develop a team approach to planning for student needs.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: November

Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Standards-based data (FSA, unit assessments, etc.) collected from 2022-2023 school year showed an increase in grade level proficiency in Math. Twenty five percent of students across grades 3-5 are performing below grade level in reading and need standards-based instruction that meets the depth of the standard and interventions to fill gaps based on their individual needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency in Math will increase 5% from 75% to 80% as measured by end of the year FAST assessments.

Monitoring:

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

PM1 and PM2 along with unit assessments will be used to progress monitor student progress toward proficiency throughout the year. Data chats around grade level and individual students will be held after each cycle.

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.)

Strategically focus on whole group and small group instruction to ensure explicit and systematic instruction is targeted to the needs of the students. Provide additional supports, school based professional development, and coaching/feedback to increase teacher content knowledge, facilitate meaningful discourse, and elicit and use evidence of student thinking to improve student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective teaching of mathematics facilitates discourse among students to build shared understanding of mathematical ideas by analyzing and comparing student approaches to problem solving as well as arguments about solution strategies. Using evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward understanding allow teachers to adjust instruction throughout a lesson in ways that both support and extend learning.

Using assessment data to align and target specific skills during intervention periods as well as focus on the use of high-yield routines during core instruction will allow all students to progress to mastery of grade level benchmarks.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Engage in collaborative planning utilizing the B1G-M to support implementing the BEST Standards, benchmark clarification, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the fully weight of the standards. Planning will incorporate techniques to enhance student talk and engagement.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Provide regular structures for planning where teachers regularly engage in data/student work analysis and lesson planning for scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with special needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions for students above benchmark.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: October

Implement a plan for tracking students not meeting the benchmark in the early grades, including the intervention being provided, and frequently monitoring progress. Develop a team approach to planning for student needs.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: November

Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the year

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our current level of performance is 72% based on SSA proficiency scores. The gap is occurring due to a lack of student-centered instruction at the level of the standard, including prior year standards being assessed. With a focus on teaching prior year standards/vocabulary along with new standards at the level of the standard, proficiency will increase.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency in science will increase 5% from 72% to 77% as measured by end of the year SSA assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Unit assessments, mid-year, and mock assessments will be used to progress monitor student progress toward proficiency throughout the year. Data chats around grade level and individual students will be held after each cycle.

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.)

Monitor whole group instruction to ensure instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence-based strategies. A focus on classroom discussion routines and high engagement strategies to activate prior knowledge of previously taught standards will be a focus of instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Activating prior knowledge helps students see the connections between previous learning and new instruction, builds on what students already know, provides a framework for learners to better understand new information, and gives instructors formative assessment information to adapt instruction. This will support our focus on assuring students have mastered prior year standards.

Classroom discussion is a method of teaching, that involves the entire class in a discussion. This practice allows teachers to see if students have learned the concepts that are being taught. Discussions will enhance student-centered rich conversations around the standard/learning target, providing students opportunities to analyze and apply their learning through discussion and maintain high engagement.

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.

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including supports for students with exceptional supports and English language supports.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: October

During collaborative planning provide regular structures for engaging in data/student work as preparing for upcoming lessons, including scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Employ instructional practices that result in students doing the work of the lesson (higher-order questioning, limiting teacher talks, and high quality feedback).

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: November

Employ practices to motivate and deepen student engagement (novel tasks, meaningful tasks, task embedded in game structures, and choices)

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: October

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Data collected through parent conferences, parent surveys, student interviews, and walkthroughs show a continued need for parent communication around standard expectations/data and academic recognition systems.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the ways students can be recognized for academic accomplishments (growth in areas, meeting expectations in academic programs, goal setting).
Increase the communication to families about how to understand the data they receive each cycle and communication around the standards being taught.

Monitoring:

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

Data on the recognition of students will be done through our tier one plan each month and at the end of each grading period. Communication around standards/testing will be monitored through SAC and parent surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole McClister (mcclistern@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.)

Effectively communicate with families and community members about the state of the school and our instructional practices. Actively invite parents in our school initiatives and help families be more connected to the classroom through knowing what their child is learning and the expectations laid out by the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When families, school, and communities work effectively together, this partnership becomes a powerful tool to improve student achievement. through communication with families about standards expectation and the progress of each child, we can partner with families and enhance a student's academic path. Working with community partners can also grow our village to support the whole child and assure all students are highly engaged in school.

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.

Create monthly newsletters with academic standards being taught in each grade level to communicate learning happening around campus. This newsletter will include testing information when appropriate.

Person Responsible: Nicole McClister (mcclistern@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Communicate what is happening on campus regularly through our website and social media platforms.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Provide academic tools and ways to support student achievement through parent conferences, student led-conferences, and school wide academic events.

Person Responsible: Nicole McClister (mcclistern@pcsb.org)

By When: November

Recognize student academic accomplishments (goals, report cards, online programs) throughout the month and at the end of the grading period. Communicate the celebrations with families and the school community.

Person Responsible: Nicole McClister (mcclistern@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly and each grading period

Increase schoolwide experience that motivate and deepen student and staff engagement

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Standards-based data showed students performing below grade level in English Language Arts and Math. 24% of students were proficient in ELA according to 2023 FAST scores. 35% of students were proficient in Math according to 2023 FAST scores.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency in ELA will increase 26% from 24% to 50% as measured by end of the year FAST assessments. Proficiency in Math will increase 15% from 35% to 50% as measured by end of the year FAST assessments.

Monitoring:

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

ESE students growth toward proficiency will be monitored through district formative assessments and state progress monitoring. Administration will check the progress of IEP goal data through data chats with ESE and Gen Ed teachers.

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.)

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all ESE students during core and intervention instruction. Ensure specially designed instruction is based on student needs/data. Enhance staff capacity through PLC/professional development in providing interventions a strong focus on foundational skills. Enhance inclusion practices to allow gen ed teachers and ESE teachers to collaboratively work toward student's standard mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using the foundational skill diagnostic tools, targeted interventions can be provided based on student's individual gaps in learning. Focus on professional learning in the use of research-based interventions matched to students goals. Utilizing various service models will allow gen ed and ESE teachers to collaboratively plan for filling gaps while working towards grade level standards.

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.

Identify needs through use of diagnostic tools (ELFAC, PAST, running records) and track student's needs through a data tracking tool used for all ESE and L25 students. Use data to determine instructional needs/ intervention, write IEP goals, and determine service delivery models.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: October

PLCs/Unit planning meetings will be used to collaborate between ESE teachers and Gen Ed. Admin. Focus will be on progress in general education classroom, use of accommodations, and IEP goal progress.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Administration and ESE Staff Developers will facilitate PLC meetings to support teachers with resources, data tracking (progress monitoring), scheduling, social skills planning, and IEP Development.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Review IEP goals, OPM data, state assessment data to determine instructional goals and service delivery model for each student with ESE team and MTSS team.

Person Responsible: Holly Huey (hueyh@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.