Pinellas County Schools

Mcmullen Booth Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 5

Needs Assessment 9

Planning for Improvement 13

Positive Culture & Environment 0

Budget to Support Goals 0

Mcmullen Booth Elementary School

3025 UNION ST, Clearwater, FL 33759

http://www.mcmullen-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Stephanie Whitaker

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2020

2019-20 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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2020-21: (42%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of McMullen-Booth Elementary School is to work together to meet the needs of each and every student through rigorous and relational opportunities that will ensure their highest academic achievement and support our students as leaders of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success.

School Leadership Team

Membership
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Whitaker, Stephanie	Principal	Maintain a safe learning environment for all students. Engage stakeholders in decision making process. Monitor implementation of standards and curriculum. Analyze Data and work with instructional staff to ensure students are making at least one year's worth of growth. Facilitate the decision making process through SBLT/ MTSS including academic, behavior (pbis).
Ekstrom, Christine	Assistant Principal	Maintain a safe learning environment for all students. Engage stakeholders in decision making process. Monitor implementation of standards and curriculum. Analyze Data and work with instructional staff to ensure students are making at least one year's worth of growth.
Peters, Stacey	Behavior Specialist	Work with administration to ensure that implementation of PBIS throughout the campus. Work a safe and secure learning environment for all students.
Garcia, Nicole	Instructional Coach	MTSS coach: Data Analysis and monitoring of students moving through layers of support through the MTSS/RTI process. Facilitate PLC's.
Bilello, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	Co-facilitate the development of ELA SIP goals. Monitor for effectiveness with leadership team.
Kelly, Cathy	Teacher, K-12	Co-Facilitate the development and implementation of Math and Science SIP gaols.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/14/2020, Stephanie Whitaker

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
30

Total number of students enrolled at the school
460

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 6/20/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	56	74	71	72	72	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419
Attendance below 90 percent	9	5	8	10	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	13	20	22	23	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	11	13	20	15	16	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	56	74	71	72	72	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419
Attendance below 90 percent	9	5	8	10	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	13	20	22	23	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	11	13	20	15	16	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	52%			46%			47%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%			38%			58%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%			45%			52%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	56%			45%			57%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	59%			42%			62%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%			39%			46%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	42%			41%			54%	53%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	49%	56%	-7%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	38%	56%	-18%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	48%	62%	-14%	62%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	64%	0%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	60%	-3%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	27	31	24	37	46	47					
ELL	44	48	46	49	55	50	33				
BLK	42	36		36	46						
HSP	46	49	40	56	57	47	35				
MUL	70			80							
WHT	57	67		59	59		45				
FRL	48	49	26	48	51	39	40				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	23	25		18	30	30	5				
ELL	37	35		46	48		45				
BLK	33			27	30		18				
HSP	37	38	50	45	47		48				
WHT	56	37		47	37		39				
FRL	45	40	44	41	46	42	48				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	28	47	46	34	47	42	43				
ELL	43	53	50	60	67	44	50				
BLK	31	48	42	30	50	45	31				
HSP	43	55	48	57	62	45	43				
MUL	56	67		50	80						
WHT	55	62	62	65	64	47	71				
FRL	46	61	58	53	61	49	51				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	401
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

While we have shown improvement some improvement with L25 growth in both math and ELA this school year, it has not been a significant level of growth compared to the previous school year. ELA proficiency continues to fall below math proficiency. Students in the Black subgroup continue to score below 41% in ELA proficiency and SWD students also scored below the 41% threshold in ELA proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement based off progress monitoring and state assessments is low growth seen within our subgroups including L25, black, and SWD.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Based on the data trends mentioned above through state testing and trends discussed through our SBLT and PLC processes the greatest contributing factor is a need for more intentional and targeted small group planning. Working with PLC's more closely in the area of ELA to identify needs assessed by students and identifying skills and standards needed by students and the skills and strategies that will make the biggest impact to accelerate individual student learning.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The biggest area of improvement came in the area of mathematics. Our current data is trending to pre-COVID rates of growth and proficiency.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The biggest contributing factor came from the implementation of PLC protocols that were facilitated with our district mathematics coach. These were introduced during a leadership meeting and we implemented these protocols in the area of mathematics with fidelity because it was the area that we felt saw the most severe area of decline post-COVID.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The use of the PLC protocols will continue to be used in the area of mathematics with a focus on small group/individualized acceleration in order see increases in our L25 subgroup learning gains. The PLC protocols will also be implemented with fidelity in PLC's targeting ELA to provide teachers with increased opportunities to identify fluid student needs relating to standards being introduced in class and to provide assistance in grouping students and identifying the high yields strategies that are most effective relating to skills and standards needing acceleration. Opportunities during small group rotations for students not meeting with the teacher to work on rigorous tasks with intentionality.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Monthly PLC's with grade level teachers with a focus on using formative progress monitoring collected to make instructional decisions, specific to small groups and small group tasks. During these PLC's we will focus on the skills and strategies needed by students in order to cross walk standards and benchmarks and providing a focus on the development of small group learning opportunities with rigor.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Use of the PLC protocol, which they are already familiar with because of the use of the protocol with fidelity monthly in the area of mathematics. This protocol will provide the framework for the expectations during the PLC, gives actionable steps to move forward with, provides leadership with look -fors and focus points for individual data chats and walk throughs targeting small group instruction.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	After analyzing walkthrough trends, observation outcomes, and fluid student data throughout the year (progress monitoring, MAP, FSA (specific to L25 growth which was our lowest areas of growth: L25 ELA growth 40%, L25 math growth 41%) , it was determined that small group instruction was not occurring with fidelity or was not being implemented to target the specific skills need to accelerate the learning of the students in relation to the standards being targeted. Looking at school wide trends, in instances where small group work or teacher led small group instruction was occurring regularly for all students, the skills being targeted were not designed to accelerate the learning of the needs of the students in the class, they were either not targeting the crosswalk foundational skills or were not rigorous enough to provide students with what they needed to see a year's worth of growth. In addition, small groups were not being differentiated based on accelerating the students' current needs, but was instead based on data that was collected from MAP and not fluid based on gains students may or may not be making. Students are not being provided with consistent opportunities to accelerate their current level of performance with strategies that are targeted to the areas of focus specific to that student's needs. This is consistent in both the areas of ELA and Mathematics. Based on PLC data chat outcomes and walk through trends, more support needs to be provided so that teachers feel comfortable identifying the skills and strategies that students need to accelerate their current levels of performance.
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 from 52% to 62% in grades 3-5 as measured by the Cambium state progress monitoring tool. We will also see a year's worth of growth from 60% or more of students in grades K-5 as measured by either the STAR early Literacy Progress monitoring tool (K-2) or the Cambium progress monitoring tool in grades 3-5. This growth goal will remain consistent in the area of mathematics with proficiency of students growing from 56% proficient grades 3-5 to 66% proficient as measured by the same assessment and student growth will grow to 69% from 59% . Our lowest quartile of students will see growth as measured by the new assessment tools over 50% in both mathematics and ELA which will be an increase of 10% for both groups in both subjects.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Through the action steps below, including teacher change in instruction based off of feedback given based off of walkthroughs and observations, student data collected both formal and informal, subgroup growth as monitored during SBLT/PLC work from formative assessment checks given between formal progress monitoring windows.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction based on data during small group and intervention small group instruction, including supports for students with exceptional student needs, English

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced tasks for students above benchmark.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	higher achieving students. In other instances small groups were not being differentiated based on accelerating the students' current needs. Based on PLC data chat outcomes and walk through trends, more conversation and support needs to be provided so that teachers feel comfortable identifying the skills and strategies that students need to accelerate their current levels of performance. Students are not being provided with consistent opportunities to accelerate their current level of performance with strategies that are targeted to the areas of focus specific to that student's needs.

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.

Develop a professional development, PLC plan which supports the analysis of the FL B.E.S.T standards for both ELA and mathematics to ensure that teachers/grade levels understand the pre-requisite skills needed for mastery of the depth of the standard.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Ensure feedback is given based on informal observations of the small group instruction focusing on instructional supports being provided to groups of students based on their data and needs including but not limited to exceptional student needs, English Language Support needs, as well as extensions/more advanced tasks for students above benchmark. Provide additional instructional support to foster inquiry skills within small groups to include the development of higher order questioning, small group discussions, problem solving activities and collaborative group structures. Communicate with teachers highlighting evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

As we transition to IB candidacy, focus on employing instructional practices which encompass the IB learner profiles which also correlate strongly to high-yields strategies for student instruction including but not limited to students setting positive expectations for success, tasks or other approaches to stimulate curiosity, meaningful tasks that are related to student interests/cultural backgrounds, thought provoking challenges.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmarks in the early grades, including targeted small group instruction, which is frequently monitored with teachers during PLC and SBLT to accelerate student learning in both mathematics and ELA.

Person Responsible Nicole Garcia (garcian@pcsb.org)

Utilize multiple forms of formative assessment and use the district data PLC protocol to game plan to utilize differentiated resources to inform future instruction. This is consistent for both mathematics and ELA.

Person Responsible Christine Ekstrom (ekstromc@pcsb.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on 2020-2021 data (and will be updated with Spring 2022 data to follow), 40% of students in the black/African American Subgroup were scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA FSA last spring, this data trend remained constant during the 2021-2022 spring state testing cycle, with again 40% of our students in the black subgroup scoring below proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Proficiency demonstrated by students in the Black/African American subgroup will increase to 50% in grades 3-5 in the spring of 2023 as measured by the Cambrium progress monitoring assessment tool.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Subgroup data will be monitored during SBLT by looking istation growth monthly and correlating that to ELFAC data when appropriate as well as ongoing progress monitoring tools implemented during modules assessments, as well as istation data ISIP monthly data collection.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Differentiated Small Group instruction, ensuring supports are in place based on data which target foundational skills needed to close achievement gaps and accelerated learning. These supports will also include access to grade level text and beyond, review of previously taught benchmarks, writing with feedback, and access to rigorous mathematical tasks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for	In order to push students to accelerate their learning with high yields strategies that target the specific cross walk benchmarks needed to access standards needed to reach proficiency and growth goals, targeted data chats need to occur in order to identify these standards/benchmarks and the specific high yields strategy that targets the student's specific needs. Through intentionally planned small group instruction both during intervention and core, students will have access to the skills needed to access rigorous tasks during whole group instruction.

selecting this strategy.

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 supports are in place that target specific student need based on ELFAC data (as needed), ISIP reports, as well as formative assessments that are embedded within the module.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Implement PLC protocols with a specific focus on students who are in the black ESSA subgroup. Spending time focusing on what the data says about each student and their individual foundational needs and game planning next steps specific to those needs.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Utilize administrator walkthrough feedback cycle specifically focused on students in the black ESSA subgroup looking for trends in rigor of task completed by identified students, higher order questioning used with students during small group and whole group, student need being addressed during small group and that each small group is targeting a skill specific to the students in the group.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Through SBLT and PLC data analysis target students early who are not making progress towards goals, including changes to small group, changes in small group instructor, changes in strategies being used, and frequently monitoring this data to identify gaps early.

Person Responsible Nicole Garcia (garcian@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The area of focus for Science will be whole group instruction, specific to utilizing science curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students and monitoring whole whole group instruction to ensure that these evidence based principles are being implemented. The rationale for a more intentional focus on whole group instruction comes from our the fairly consistent fifth grade science scores for fifth grade as measured by SSA being between 40% and 45% historically. Spring of 2022 saw a proficiency score of 42% and the spring of 2021 with science proficiency measuring at 43%. In order for us to break from this plateau, we and surpass the 50% proficient mark, we need to ensure that students have access to high-yields strategies that are implemented with fidelity across the grades.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By implementing more rigorous whole group instruction, with a focus on providing students through this instruction opportunities to engage in complex, grade level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard or the benchmark, science scores as measured by 5th grade SSA will increase by 12% in the spring of 2023 to an achieved proficiency of 54%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The area of focus will be monitored through lesson plan monitoring, informal walk throughs with feedback, trend analysis through SBLT with feedback to instructional staff, with a focus on the complexity of the task, time students have to do the heavy thinking of the task, alignment of the task to the rigor of the standard.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Monitoring whole group instruction to ensure that instruction is designed and implemented according to evidence based principles and that this instruction is standards aligned with rigorous expectations for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria	Because we have remained consistently under the 50% proficient threshold in fifth grade SSA proficiency, we need to continue to ensure that our whole group instruction is being implemented consistently with fidelity with a focus on ensuring that instructional supports are in place for student during core instruction and that this instruction is aligned to the rigor of the standard specifications and that the expectations set are high for all students.

used for selecting this strategy.

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.

Work within PLC's to look at instructional materials, understanding how the materials selected connect to evidence-based practices and NGSSS.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Make strategic decisions about implementation of the curriculum to maximize impact on student learning, including but not limited to common planning, materials management, and use of collaborative structures for high-level engagements tasks.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Provide all students consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content and activities aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and independence, including students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond, small group instruction based on data, review of previously taught benchmarks as well as preview of upcoming benchmarks.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Utilize administrator walkthrough and weekly feedback cycle to individual teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices in science that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Employ instructional practices that result in students doing the work of the lesson (higher-order questioning, quick demonstration followed by practice, limiting teacher talk, high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback).

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. 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 critical need from the data reviewed.	Because of our SWD only achieving 34% of their federal index points, a more targeted plan needs to be implemented in order to ensure that the instructional needs of students in this category are having their instructional needs met and that students are meeting both proficiency and growth goals.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By providing students with disabilities intentionally designed instruction in the foundational skills necessary for them to engage in rigorous, grade level content, the percentage of points achieved by the SWD ESSA subgroup will rise from 34% to 50% during the 2022-2023 school year.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Ongoing progress monitoring will be monitored during SBLT in collaboration of the ESE teachers at the school and feedback/professional development will be given to target data trends.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Garcia (garcian@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Instruct students with disabilities in foundational skills necessary to engage in rigorous, grade-level content, aligned to IEP goals resulting in specially designed small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Because only 34% of our SWD ESSA subgroup are reaching their proficiency and growth goals, we need to ensure that not only whole group, but targeted small group within the classroom is happening with fidelity that is aligned to IEP goals and data analysis is resulting in specially designed instruction to meet each student's unique needs.

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.

Provide instructional supports that are aligned to IEP goals and specially designed to meet each student and their unique needs.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Use evidence-based practices for students with disabilities to teach foundational literacy and mathematics skills.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Make rigorous texts, materials, content and activities accessible to students through supplementary aids, including assistive technology.

Person Responsible Christine Ekstrom (ekstromc@pcsb.org)

Embed strategies into content-based instruction to teach students critical memory and engagement processes they can use to access, retain, and generalize important content.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Provide multiple opportunities for students to engage in and respond to instruction using their primary mode of communication, which may include the use of augmentative or alternative communication systems or visual supports and other prompts to support student success.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

Collect data and monitor progress towards IEP goals and objectives on an intentional and regular schedule. Adjust services and accommodations if supported by data.

Person Responsible Stephanie Whitaker (whitakers@pcsb.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

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

Implementation of small group instructional practices will be planned for and implemented with fidelity so that student proficiency will increase to 60% in grades K-2.

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

Implementation of small group instructional practices will be planned for and implemented with fidelity so that student proficiency will increase to 60% in grades 3-5.

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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)

By implementing small group instruction students in grades K-2 will see 60% proficiency in ELA.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By implementing small group instruction students in grades 3-5 will see 60% proficiency in ELA .

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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The implementation of small group will be monitotred through walk through trends and analyzed during SBLT. PLC's will be held monthly where small group ELA data will specifically be monitored and planned for.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Whitaker, Stephanie, whitakers@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
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. Â§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?

The evidence based practice being implemented in grades K-5 is small group differentiated instruction. This is aligned with best practices in the reading plan and is a best practice for the B.E.S.T ELA standards alignment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

This was selected after carefully looking at subgroup data and walk through trends. Based on the data we are seeing, students need opportunity for accessing standards and crosswalk to benchmark standards. Through small group instruction students will have access to the benchmarks and have access to more rigorous standard crosswalk and learning acceleration.

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
MTSS coach will serve as a literacy coach and spend a majority of their time supporting ELA data analysis during PLC's and SBLT.	Whitaker, Stephanie, whitakers@pcsb.org
Students will be given specific instruction aimed at data trends indicating which crosswalk benchmarks students still struggle with in order to see increased proficiency. Students will complete formative tasks monthly through the modules and will be used to plan for instruction	Whitaker, Stephanie, whitakers@pcsb.org

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Our school has focused on exploring ways in which we can set a positive school wide culture through the setting of school wide expectations with our staff and students and ensuring that our Tier 1 PBIS system reflects the acknowledgement of students who are following these expectations. In the past our school has implemented the Houses System, has participated in the Boy's Study Initiative to close the gender gap in regards to behavior and academics, has participated in a monthly Commitment to Character recognition program, used class dojo school wide as a means to award points to students and to communicate with parents, as well as monthly opportunities to recognize our staff for the work they are doing in helping our students to be successful. As we move forward, we will begin a transition to a magnet program in international studies, with the intent to apply for IB candidacy and complete requirements for IB status. We work school wide to establish our guidelines for success and demonstrate to students through school wide assemblies how these guidelines apply to the expectations for them while on campus.

Through this transition, we will shift from Commitment to Character words to the IB Learner profiles. These Learner Profiles will be introduced to students in much the same platform as prior years with our Guidelines for Success. We will begin in August with clusters of students by grade level coming to be introduced to the profile of the month and give students opportunities to interact to explore how these profiles relate to our guidelines for success. As we continue through the month we will monitor students for the use of these learner profiles that are introduced in relation to our Guidelines for Success and monitor that with the PBIS points tracker system. Our goal is to take components from the Houses System, Boys study and IB and create a PBIS Tier 1 system that intentionally combines the strategies together.

We will maintain our decreased risk ratio of male students receiving referrals, maintain our lower referral rate, and continue to see a teacher use and satisfaction rate greater than 80%. We will monitor the referral rate of our male students, and subgroups (specific to ESE) through SBLT, monitor weekly through PBIS points tracker the disparity in points given and received in relation to our GFS and Learner profiles and survey teachers quarterly as we work to combine the new Profiles with the existing pieces that we have identified to bring forward with us as we make the shift this year.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Stephanie Whitaker -Principal - Responsible for establishing and maintaining positive school wide culture and environment.
Christine Ekstrom- Assistant Principal- Responsible for work with principal to establish and maintain positive school wide culture and environment.
Nicky Garcia- MTSS coach- responsible for working with stakeholders through SBLT to review data and problem solve.
Fran Neubaurer- Magnet coordinator
Stacey Peters- Behavior Specialist- Responsible for collaborating with teachers and grade levels to problem solve and strategize preventative measures to reduce incidents of behavior infractions.
Guidance Counselor (TBA)- responsible for meeting with groups of students and working through social emotional barriers that prevent students from demonstrating GFS and learner profiles.
Social Worker (TBA)- responsible for meeting with groups of students and working through social emotional barriers that prevent students from demonstrating GFS and learner profiles.
Natalie Hoefer - Family Community Liaison- responsible for working with stakeholders outside of school to generate support for schoolwide initiatives and acting as main contact person for families and stakeholders looking to become more involved in supporting these initiatives.
PTA/SAC members- meeting with school based stakeholders to understand how our families contribute to the success of our PBIS initiative and collaborating together to create family events which highlight these initiatives and goals.