Pinellas County Schools

Seventy Fourth St. 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 20

V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence 20

VI. Title I Requirements 23

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 24

Seventy Fourth St. Elementary

3801 74TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33709

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.
Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of 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, 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
Ku, Christen	Principal	The role of the principal is to provide strategic direction in the school, support a standardized curriculum, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement data, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate the staff and oversee facilities.
Owens, Alexandra	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal - Member of the Instructional Leadership Team and support the mission/vision of 74th Street Elementary.
Bachnik, Jennifer	School Counselor	School Counselor / Bullying Investigator/ Multicultural Committee
Moore, Tatiana	Behavior Specialist	Member of the Climate and Culture Team, Support PBIS, Champion for ESE/ ASD scholars.
Brnada, Amber	Math Coach	Leads collaborative planning focusing on implementing solid core instruction.
Bennett, Tammi	Reading Coach	Leads collaborative planning focusing on implementing solid core instruction.

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.

Prior to the end of the 2023 - 2024 staff members provided feedback on our current SIP. Our SIP was created based upon this feedback, achievement data and input from our ILT.

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))

SIP will continue to be monitored through our work with the Bureau of School Improvement, data walks with our TZ ISD team as well as our site based ILT.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History	2021-22: D 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	20	28	22	25	15	15	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	0	5	5	8	0	5	0	0	0	23
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	4	1	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	19	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	22	15	0	0	0	39
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	3	2	12	9	0	0	0	26

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	1	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

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	2	37	39	24	22	23	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	50	44	0	0	0	120
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	40	47	0	0	0	110
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	1	2	8	4	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	2	37	39	24	22	23	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	50	44	0	0	0	120
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	40	47	0	0	0	110
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	10	14	5	7	10	0	0	0	56

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	2	8	4	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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*	29	55	56	40	54	57
ELA Learning Gains	39	62	61	55	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34	55	52	46	54	53
Math Achievement*	39	62	60	43	61	63
Math Learning Gains	49	65	64	41	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34	54	55	32	48	51
Science Achievement*	35	57	51	39	53	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	57			67		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	316
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	22	Yes	3	3
ELL	35	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	3	
HSP	47			
MUL	32	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	37	Yes	1	
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	29	39	34	39	49	34	35					57
SWD	11	15	8	23	38	38	21					
ELL	21	25		38	50		17					57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	45	50	22	38	20	33					
HSP	40	46		43	63		33					55
MUL	27			36								
PAC												
WHT	26	35	30	49	49	40	32					
FRL	26	41	38	38	46	30	34					57

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	25	32	31	32	26	31	32					45
SWD	11	28		22	17		10					20
ELL	22			33								45
AMI												
ASN	58			67								
BLK	18			18			25					
HSP	27	47		33	18		40					43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	22	19		32	38		30					
FRL	25	37		29	23	20	32					38

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	40	55	46	43	41	32	39					67
SWD	14	37	50	25	30	27	0					
ELL	26	44		43	36		21					67
AMI												
ASN	60	70		67	60							
BLK	24	52	40	32	28		23					
HSP	35	56	50	41	38		30					76
MUL	67	50		57	50							
PAC												
WHT	41	55	53	42	43	37	43					
FRL	38	56	55	39	37	36	38					71

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	35%	57%	-22%	54%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	58%	-4%	58%	-4%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	53%	-22%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	40%	62%	-22%	59%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	66%	-9%	61%	-4%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	61%	-9%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	47%	60%	-13%	51%	-4%

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.

Although ELA improved from an overall 29% to a 41%, it is our lowest scoring content area. As stated in our data meeting by Dr. Brown, we have an ELA emergency. We are very proud of the 12% growth we achieved this past year. We will continue to build upon this success.

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

Our cohorts in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade all showed improvement from the previous year. ELA improved from a 29% to a 41%. Math improved from a 39% to a 51%. Science improved from a 35% to a 47%. This year we were focusing mainly on proficiency, so the opportunity for growth this upcoming school year willl be focusing on our bottom quartile.

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.

Our 3rd grade math scores had the greatest gap in comparison to the state and district. They scored 40% in comparison to 59% at the state and 62% at the district level. The factors that contributed to this

gap are lack of new benchmark knowledge, the need for collaborative planning with a focus on students owning the work, and instructional staff movement.

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

Both math and ELA showed double digit gains. Collaborative planning became a non-negotiable this school year. ILT followed up by walking classroom to ensure aligned content was being taught, data supported the alignment and necessary pivots were made to spiral curriculum where necessary.

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

Attendance is still an opportunity for growth. We have over 30% of our scholars absent 10% or more.

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

1. Ensure target/task alignment to the rigor of the benchmark in all content areas.
2. Provide collaborative opportunities where the scholars are doing the heavy lifting.
3. Increase daily attendance rate by 10%.
4. Continue to provide instructional personnel with professional development opportunities to improve their instructional performance that overall improves student achievement.

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

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

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

Benchmark-based data (FAST, formative assessments, walkthrough data, BSI data, etc.) collected from the 2022-2023 school year showed students were performing below grade level in ELA, Math and Science. Although we made growth in all subject areas, this data continues to show a need for more consistency with benchmark-based task/target alignment as well as students being provided more opportunities to be successful with benchmark-aligned tasks. In order to do this, teachers will have access to more frequent progress monitoring data to support our students' achievement as measured by the BEST benchmarks.

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 10% (from 47% to 57%) as measured by SSA.
Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 10% (from 41% to 51%) as measured by FAST.
Proficiency in Mathematics will increase 10% (from 51% to 61%) as measured by FAST.

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

The area of focus will be monitored by FAST progress monitoring, end of module assessments, iReady diagnostic, checks for understanding, and walk-through feedback from the instructional leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christen Ku (kuc@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 collaboratively plan with a content expert instructional coach for benchmark-based lessons with the end in mind as it directly relates to student task. The student tasks must get to the end result which allows the student to master the standard. The teacher will focus on task alignment, develop foundational skills and monitor student evidence in order to take action if needed.

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

Deepen understanding Florida's B.E.S.T benchmarks/FSASS (Florida’s State Academic Standards of Science) as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes. Synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards. Prior to teaching any lesson, instructional staff will plan with the end in mind and focus on the student task. This will be done through collaborative planning sessions with coaches and teachers (Gen Ed/ESE/ELL). After planning the lessons and discussing possible misconceptions, teachers must observe and monitor student work to and make instructional decisions based on student evidence. Student misconceptions can then be corrected with a whole class or small group reteach.

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.

Purposefully combine/stack standards and benchmarks to support learning so that a benchmark is spotlighted and supporting benchmarks that enhance instruction are incorporated in the lesson to meet the demands of the spotlighted benchmark.

Person Responsible: Christen Ku (kuc@pcsb.org)

By When: This action step will be implemented the first full week of school during collaborative planning. Implementation of this step will be monitored by formative assessments and walkthrough data.

EL, ESE, ASD and Gen. Ed teachers are provided the opportunity to collaboratively plan with content specialists in order to plan for differentiated instruction and support of delivery services using the MPI indicators in the ELA modules.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

By When: This action step will be implemented the first full week of school during collaborative planning. Implementation of this step will be monitored by formative assessments and walkthrough data.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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

In the 2023- 2024 school year we will have high expectations for all of our students including our six subgroups; Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners, White, Black and Multiracial. Our subgroup proficiency scores have shown minimal to no gains for three years. Although learning gains were not calculated this year previously, learning gains and L25 learning gains have also been minimal. We believe there is a foundational literacy gap with a high percentage of our students. It is our firm belief that providing high expectations for our scholars with benchmark aligned rigorous instruction, it will lead to a much-improved overall school score.

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

The percentage of students reaching ELA proficiency will increase to 54% in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades.
The percentage of students making learning gains will increase to 65%.
The percentage of L25 students making learning gains will increase to 70%

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

The area of focus will be monitored by FAST progress monitoring, end of module assessments, iReady diagnostic, checks for understanding, and walk-through feedback from the instructional leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christen Ku (kuc@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.)

We are clustering students based on language proficiency, instructional needs and data to provide an inclusive, core environment for all students. In addition, all students will have access to the on-grade level text. They will be required to perform the same tasks with necessary supports. Data for each student will be examined to determine foundational gaps and instruction will occur during intervention block and core instructional time to close learning gaps.

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

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

All students will learn the BEST standards and have a better chance of mastering grade level standards. All teachers will plan collaboratively with instructional coaches and prepare to teach collaboratively in order to provide specialized instruction that is aligned to grade level standards. Foundational gaps will be addressed during the intervention block in small groups.

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.

Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback ensuring ample time is given to students to read and write appropriate grade-level text (while applying foundational skills) with high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback.

Person Responsible: Christen Ku (kuc@pcsb.org)

By When: This action step will be implemented the first full week of school during collaborative planning. Implementation of this step will be monitored by formative assessments and walkthrough data.

EL teachers will plan collaboratively to front load content, vocabulary and context to scaffold up to the rigor of the standard for our EL and Hispanic subgroups. During collaborative planning EL teachers will ensure classroom teachers have identified each LY student and their proficiency level. ELL teachers and coaches will provide support using the MPI's embedded within the modules. Just in time coaching will be requested from the EL department as needed.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

By When: This action step will be implemented the first full week of school during collaborative planning. Implementation of this step will be monitored by formative assessments and walkthrough data.

ESE teachers will plan collaboratively to front load content, vocabulary and context to scaffold up to the rigor of the benchmark for our SWD subgroup. During collaborative planning ESE teachers will ensure classroom teachers have identified each ESE student and the supports outlined in their IEP.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

By When: This action step will be implemented the first full week of school during collaborative planning. Implementation of this step will be monitored by formative assessments and walkthrough data.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Creating consistent and predictable environments where expectations are explicit so that the whole school community knows how to be successful.

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

This will be measured by our ClassDojo data. The expectation is that 90% of students will earn 90% of their points. The paw perks incentives will be indicative of its success.

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

Climate Survey Results
Multiple opportunites for solicited, onsite feedback
Monitoring of participating in collaborative planning
Monitoring adherence to PBIS

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christen Ku (kuc@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.)

Professional Development
Weekly PLCs
Team building activities
Health and Wellness opportunities

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

These strategies will allow teachers to feel supported in both their health and wellness as well as their professional growth.

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.

Consistent professional development that aligns with the needs of our teachers.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Owens (owensal@pcsb.org)

By When: Every Tuesday after school all instructional staff will attend.

Health and Wellness Opportunities will be extended to all staff. They will sent via email, posted in the weekly update as well as posted on the dashboard in the work room.

Person Responsible: Christen Ku (kuc@pcsb.org)

By When: This will be offered monthly

Consistently engaging staff in team building activities

Person Responsible: Christen Ku (kuc@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly throughout the year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Pinellas County Schools Superintendent and the Pinellas County School Board have invested in a strong support structure that creates an increasing number of strategies and interventions to support schools in need. The district has robust systems, processes, and measures to continually review the progress in the schools in support of their continued improvement. Data review has informed the various aspects of this plan. It connects several ongoing monitoring systems to support the schools in alignment with the domains for school turnaround: Effective Leadership, Collaborative Teaching, Ambitious Instruction and Learning, Safe and Supportive Environment, and Family and Community Engagement. The Leadership Team will continue to meet weekly to monitor the progress of our Differentiated Accountability (DA) schools. Issues identified in the process include but are not limited to the following: teacher concerns, staffing model, technology, facilities, instructional practices, the effectiveness of School-based Leadership Teams, coaching support model, allocation of resources, progress monitoring, and student performance. The team evaluates identified issues weekly and establishes a plan of action to resolve them effectively and efficiently.
A majority of our title 1 and UniSIG funds are used to purchase Instructional Staff Developers for ELA, Math and Science. These ISDs plan for collaborative planning, provide coaching to teachers and are directly tied to student achievement. This year the coaching model has been refined to include ISDs being the teacher of record for a specific cohort of students.
Additional money is allocated to resources that are used to support core instruction and academic interventions based upon assessment data.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

K - 2 teachers are participating in the PELI grant through the work of the Lastinger Center at the University of Florida. A cite based primary reading coach and administration will strategically support the equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching and feedback.

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

A cite based ELA coach and administration will strategically support teachers in grades 3 - 5 through the equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching and feedback.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Our 2023 STAR scores grades K - 2 indicate that 48% of our scholars are proficient in ELA based on the STAR Reading or Early Literacy assessment. Our goal for the 2024 school year is for our ELA scores to improve to 54% proficiency as measured by the STAR, Iready, formative assessments, running records.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Our scores on the 2023 FAST indicate that 41% of our 3rd - 5th grade scholars are proficient in ELA. Our goal for the 2024 school year is for our ELA scores to improve to 51% proficiency as measured by the FAST, Iready and formative assessments.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

During the school year, our Leadership Literacy team will review our ELA data monthly to ensure we are tracking progress of our scholars towards our grade level goals. We will also monitor our teachers participation in PLC's and PD by sign in sheets and classroom walkthrough/feedback provided by both administration and our ELA coach.

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

Bennett, Tammi , bennettta@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

o Provides print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction
o Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words
o Reinforce the effectiveness of instruction in alphabetics, fluency, and vocabulary
o Provide instruction in broad oral language skills
o Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies
o Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

To develop literacy, students need instruction in two related sets of skills: foundational reading skills and reading comprehension skills. Employing the evidence-based strategies and action steps will enable students to read words (alphabetics), relate those words to their oral language, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency to understand what they read.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy coaches work with school principals to plan and implement consistent professional learning outlined by the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative around evidence-based practices grounded in the science of reading as well as the UFLI Flamingo Small group model to demonstrate a significant effect on improving student outcomes.	Ku, Christen, kuc@pcsb.org
Build capacity by identifying teachers, coaches, and district staff who can support training in understanding how high-quality instructional materials connect to evidence-based practices and the B.E.S.T standards.	Ku, Christen, kuc@pcsb.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Specific information about the SIP, UniSIG and Title 1 budgets are shared at the annual Title 1 meeting during Open House. This information is also disseminated to families, local businesses and organizations at the annual State of the School.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We will open our campus to families on a plethora of occasions including student led conferences, Jaguar Jams, All-Pro dads, monthly family events calendared out for the school year. Weekly we will use

school messager to contact families as well as class dojo to keep them updated on their child's progress and the school's happenings.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Our teachers are attending weekly collaborative planning to strengthen target/task alignment and overall quality of core instruction. Data will be used to create plans to spiral instruction for remediation. We will create additional learning opportunities through ELP before and after school tutoring. Learning opportunities are also provided during lunch and learns. We will once again prepare for Saturday Bootcamps in the second semester.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

A variety of data sources are used in order to determine scholars that are chosen for ELP.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				$156,800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	130	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.86	$50,837.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/other certified: The instructional developer (ISD)/coach focusing on math will support the learning of both staff and scholars. The ISD will plan, prepare and implement collaborative planning weekly to address core instruction with a focus on data literacy.			
	6400	130	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.86	$57,593.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/other certified: The instructional staff developer (ISD)/coach focusing on science will support the learning of both staff and scholars. The ISD science will plan, prepare and implement collaborative planning weekly to address core instruction with a focus on data literacy.			
	6400	210	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.86	$6,899.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/retirement: Math ISD retirement contribution (13.57%).			
	6400	220	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.86	$3,889.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Math ISD FICA taxes (7.65%).			
	6400	230	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.86	$13,970.00

			Notes: Instructional staff training services/group insurance. Math ISD group insurance (average $13,245).			
	6400	210	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.86	$7,816.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/retirement: Science ISD retirement contribution (13.57%).			
	6400	220	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.86	$4,406.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Science ISD FICA taxes (7.65%).			
	6400	230	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.86	$11,390.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/group insurance. Science ISD group insurance (average $13,245).			
2	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**				**$28,882.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	120	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.14	$8,276.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/classroom teacher: The math ISD position will teach one class focusing on small group intervention for students needing additional intervention to close the learning gap. The ISD's class will present instructional practices in a model/ demonstration classroom setting for observation by all math instructors.			
	5100	120	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.14	$9,010.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/classroom teacher: The science ISD position will teach one class focusing on small group intervention for students needing additional intervention to close the learning gap. The ISD's class will present instructional practices in a model/ demonstration classroom setting for observation by all science instructors.			
	5100	210	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.14	$1,123.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/retirement: Math ISD teacher retirement contribution (13.57%).			
	5100	220	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.14	$633.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Math ISD FICA taxes (7.65%).			
	5100	230	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.14	$2,275.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/group insurance: Math ISD group insurance (average $13,245).			
	5100	210	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.14	$1,223.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/retirement: Science ISD teacher retirement contribution (13.57%).			
	5100	220	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.14	$690.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Science ISD FICA taxes (7.65%).			
	5100	230	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG	0.14	$1,855.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/group insurance: Science ISD group insurance (average $13,245).			

	5100	120	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG		$3,132.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/classroom teacher: The school will host six three-hour Saturday bootcamps for students needing additional instructional time. These bootcamps will be held during February, March and April. Each bootcamp will be staffed by six teachers. Estimated cost for each bootcamp = $632.77 ($29/hour x 6 teachers x 3 hours = $522 + $111 fringe benefits).			
	5100	210	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG		$425.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/retirement: Saturday bootcamp retirement (13.57%).			
	5100	220	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG		$240.00
			Notes: Instruction, basic/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Saturday bootcamp FICA taxes (7.65%).			
3	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment**				**$875.58**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	510	3961 - Seventy Fourth St. Elementary	UniSIG		$875.58
			Notes: Instruction, basic/supplies: Materials and supplies supporting instructional delivery such as copies, pens, pencils, calculators, etc.			
					Total:	**$194,940.00**

Budget Approval

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

No