Pinellas County Schools

JOHN M. SEXTON ELEMENTARY SCHL

2026-27 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state’s graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Educating and inspiring students for success!

Provide the school's vision statement

100% Student Success.

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Tony Pleshe

pleshet@pcsb.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

• Recruits, develops, supports, supervises, evaluates and retains an effective and diverse faculty of instructional and support staff with a focus on increased effectiveness and student achievement.
• Models the leadership and follow-through necessary to build collaborative school-based teams which ensure curriculum and instruction initiatives are student focused, researched-based, and aligned with statutes, policies, standards and improvement plans.
• Establishes and maintains a culture of high-expectations, equity and continuous improvement through sound judgement and consistent development, support and accountability for themselves and their team.
• Maintains high visibility within the school and in the community and works to build high levels of

stakeholder engagement across all aspects of the school activities. Printed: 08/07/2025 Page 2 of 46 Pinellas JOHN M. SEXTON ELEMENTARY SCHL 2025-26 SIP

• Develops, implements, and monitors strategies and actions to make demonstrated progress toward goals within the School Improvement Plan, in alignment to the District Strategic Plan.

• Demonstrates that student learning is a top priority through leadership actions focused on student achievement and success.

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2).

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Each spring our leadership team meets to discuss our progress in meeting the goals we established the previous year. We weigh the return on investment and begin planning for the next year. All stakeholders have an opportunity to give input through surveys. Our leadership team then compiles all of the data and we begin drafting a plan. One of the leadership team attends district workshops for school improvement and we share our draft. The draft is then shared with our staff for more input before submitting the plan.

3. 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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

SIP will be monitored by the leadership team and Instructional leaders monthly. The instructional team will meet monthly and update its members regarding the SIP priorities. SIP Goal managers will provide data to the team at minimal quarterly to monitor the implementation of action steps and their effectiveness toward school goals. If action steps have not been implemented, the team creates a plan for implementation. Administration and the SBLT work collaboratively to determine the next steps to support progress toward our goals and to closing achievement gaps for all students. Progress is also shared with SAC the second semester through our State of the School presentation.

C. Demographic Data

2026-27 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	**ACTIVE**
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	**ELEMENTARY** **PK-5**
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	**K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION**
2025-26 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	
2025-26 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	**100.0%**
CHARTER SCHOOL	**NO**
RAISE SCHOOL	**YES**
2025-26 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 07/09/2026	**N/A**
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2025-26 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)** **ASIAN STUDENTS (ASN)** **BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK)** **HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP)** **MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL)** **WHITE STUDENTS (WHT)** **ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)**
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY **2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.*	**2025-26: A** **2024-25: B** **2023-24: B** **2022-23: C** **2021-22: D**

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2026-27

Using 2025-26 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	
School Enrollment	26	49	45	45	57	56				278
Absent 10% or more school days	1	15	9	9	13	13				60
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	0				4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1				1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	2	5	14	1	6				28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	1	4	6	11	2	6				30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Current Year 2026-27

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	1	2	3	10	2	6				24

Current Year 2026-27

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	2	2	0	0	0	0				4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0				0

Prior Year (2025-26) As Last 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	
School Enrollment	40	43	45	51	56	62				297
Absent 10% or more school days		14	9	14	18	14				69
One or more suspensions			2	4		6				12
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)						1				1
Course failure in Math						1				1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment			13	8	5	13				39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment		4	6	10	3	16				39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)			3	2	1					6
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)		2	3	7	2					14

Prior Year (2025-26) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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		2	2	6	4	15				29

Prior Year (2025-26) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year				3						3
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2025-26 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2026			2025			2024		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	72	68	62	61	64	59	61	61	57
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	86	70	61	66	67	59	72	63	58
ELA Learning Gains	72	65	63	55	62	60	61	64	60
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	82	63	58	64	59	56	67	62	57
Math Achievement*	73	72	66	64	69	64	55	66	62
Math Learning Gains	64	69	64	56	67	63	45	68	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	83	56	50	61	56	51	35	58	52
Science Achievement	69	72	62	64	70	58	63	69	57
Social Studies Achievement*			95			92			
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)					67	63		65	61

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2025-26 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	75%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	601
Total Components for the FPPI	8
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2025-26	2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*
75%	64%	56%	51%	41%	47%	

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2025-26 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%
Students With Disabilities	67%	No		
English Language Learners	70%	No		
Asian Students	90%	No		
Black/African American Students	72%	No		
Hispanic Students	75%	No		
Multiracial Students	64%	No		
White Students	74%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	74%	No		

D. 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.

2025-26 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2024-25	C&C ACCEL 2024-25	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	72%	86%	72%	82%	73%	64%	83%	69%					
Students With Disabilities	65%	83%	67%		65%	60%	73%	53%					
English Language Learners	60%				80%								
Asian Students	86%				93%								
Black/African American Students	63%	80%	79%	92%	51%	60%	85%	63%					
Hispanic Students	76%	83%	65%		82%	70%							
Multiracial Students	71%		58%		76%	50%							
White Students	73%	95%	73%		76%	64%		63%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	68%	84%	77%	85%	69%	63%	81%	66%					

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	61%	66%	55%	64%	64%	56%	61%	64%					88%
Students With Disabilities	50%	58%	57%	80%	40%	56%	62%	40%					
English Language Learners	62%		59%		81%	82%		71%					88%
Asian Students	73%				82%								
Black/African American Students	45%	40%	54%	70%	53%	52%		36%					
Hispanic Students	62%	75%	48%		64%	52%		71%					90%
Multiracial Students	73%		60%		53%	60%							
White Students	66%	70%	55%		69%	52%		69%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	61%	65%	57%	76%	62%	54%	59%	60%					91%

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	61%	72%	61%	67%	55%	45%	35%	63%					48%
Students With Disabilities	31%	54%	53%		9%	26%	33%	18%					
English Language Learners	67%		47%	72%		67%							48%
Asian Students	59%		62%	76%		62%							
Black/African American Students	39%	45%	50%		42%	40%		55%					
Hispanic Students	61%	73%	64%		55%	36%							
Multiracial Students	69%			69%									
White Students	70%	87%	66%		52%	44%	33%	67%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	58%	72%	61%	61%	51%	42%	30%	68%					44%

E. 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.

		2025-26 SPRING				
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	85%	68%	17%	60%	25%
ELA	4	68%	66%	2%	60%	8%
ELA	5	62%	66%	-4%	61%	1%
Math	3	81%	71%	10%	66%	15%
Math	4	74%	72%	2%	65%	9%
Math	5	62%	69%	-7%	62%	0%
Science	5	69%	70%	-1%	60%	9%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Most Improvement

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was **Mathematics achievement**, particularly in student proficiency and learning gains. Through ongoing progress monitoring, classroom assessments, and collaborative data reviews, we observed increased student performance across multiple grade levels.

Several actions contributed to this improvement. The school implemented a stronger focus on **collaborative planning and job-embedded professional development**, allowing teachers to analyze student data, align instruction to standards, and share effective instructional strategies. Administrators and instructional leaders conducted regular classroom walkthroughs and instructional monitoring to provide timely feedback and support. Teachers also utilized targeted small-group instruction, intervention groups, and frequent progress monitoring to address student needs. In addition, the school strengthened implementation of district curriculum resources and provided professional learning focused on mathematical reasoning, problem-solving, and teacher clarity. These combined efforts resulted in more consistent instruction, increased student engagement, and improved student outcomes in mathematics.

Lowest Performance

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

Based on John M. Sexton Elementary School's most recent school performance data, the **lowest-performing data component was ELA Learning Gains**, particularly among the **Lowest 25% (L25) subgroup of students**. While overall ELA proficiency remained relatively stable, learning gains decreased from prior years, indicating that a significant number of students did not make the expected annual growth despite receiving instruction and interventions.

Several factors contributed to this lower performance. Student attendance concerns, an increase in the number of students requiring intensive academic interventions, and challenges associated with accelerating learning for struggling readers impacted growth outcomes. Additionally, analysis revealed inconsistencies in the implementation of targeted interventions and progress monitoring practices across grade levels. The school also experienced a larger number of students entering below grade level, requiring more intensive support to close achievement gaps.

A trend observed over the past several years is that while overall proficiency has remained relatively strong, growth among the Lowest 25% subgroup has been more difficult to sustain. This indicates a need to strengthen differentiated instruction, intervention systems, and data-driven decision-making to ensure that students performing below grade level make accelerated progress.
In response, the school has prioritized collaborative planning, job-embedded professional development, instructional monitoring, and the use of targeted intervention strategies aligned to student needs. These efforts are intended to improve learning gains, particularly for students requiring the greatest level of support, while maintaining overall proficiency levels.

Greatest Decline

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was **ELA Learning Gains**, including a decrease in learning gains among the **Lowest 25% (L25) subgroup of students**. While overall ELA proficiency increased slightly from 61% to 62%, ELA Learning Gains declined from 61% to 56%, and ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% declined from 67% to 61%.
Several factors contributed to this decline. Data analysis indicated that many students entered the school year performing below grade level and required intensive interventions to address foundational reading deficits. In addition, attendance concerns among some students impacted instructional continuity and intervention effectiveness. The school also identified inconsistencies in the implementation of differentiated instruction, intervention delivery, and progress monitoring practices, which limited the ability to accelerate learning for students who were furthest behind.
Another contributing factor was the increased rigor of grade-level standards and assessments, which required students not only to demonstrate proficiency but also to make sufficient annual growth. While many students maintained proficiency, fewer students achieved the growth necessary to meet learning gains expectations.
The decline highlights the need for continued focus on collaborative planning, data-driven instruction, targeted interventions, teacher clarity, and consistent progress monitoring. These strategies have been incorporated into the School Improvement Plan to support accelerated learning and improve ELA growth outcomes for all students, particularly those in the Lowest 25% subgroup.

Greatest Gap

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.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was **ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% (L25) subgroup of students**. While the school continues to perform well in several areas, students in the lowest-performing quartile did not make gains at the same rate as their peers statewide. This performance gap highlights the ongoing challenge of accelerating learning for students who enter the school significantly below grade level.

Several factors contributed to this gap. A higher percentage of students in the Lowest 25% subgroup required intensive reading interventions and support to address foundational literacy skill deficits. Attendance concerns, mobility, and varying levels of academic readiness also impacted student growth. Additionally, the school identified a need for more consistent implementation of differentiated instruction, targeted intervention programs, and progress monitoring practices to ensure interventions were producing the desired results.

A trend observed over the past several years is that overall ELA proficiency has remained relatively stable, while growth measures for the Lowest 25% subgroup have fluctuated. This suggests that while many students are maintaining proficiency, the school must continue to strengthen systems that accelerate growth for struggling readers. To address this trend, John M. Sexton Elementary School has prioritized collaborative planning, job-embedded professional development, data-driven instructional decision-making, and targeted intervention supports designed to increase learning gains for students most in need of academic acceleration.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Attendance

Highest Priorities

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

1. Target-Task Alignment
2. Explicit Teach
3. Student Discourse and Collaboration
4. Monitoring for Learning and Formative Assessment

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

John M. Sexton Elementary School identified ELA Learning Gains and ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% (L25) subgroup in grades 3-5 as the primary Area of Focus for the 2026-2027 school year. While the school demonstrated solid overall achievement, data analysis revealed that student growth in reading did not meet the school's expectations and remains an area requiring focused attention. During the 2025-2026 school year, ELA proficiency was 67%, ELA Learning Gains were 70%, and ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% subgroup were 79%. Although these results reflect positive outcomes for many students, the data indicate a need to accelerate growth for all learners, particularly students performing below grade level.

This area of focus directly impacts student learning because reading proficiency serves as the foundation for success across all academic content areas. Students who demonstrate strong growth in reading are better equipped to access grade-level standards, engage in meaningful discourse, comprehend complex texts, and achieve success in mathematics, science, and other subject areas. Increasing student learning gains will ensure that more students make adequate yearly progress and are prepared for future academic challenges.

The need was identified through a comprehensive review of schoolwide achievement data, progress monitoring results, subgroup performance, and trend analyses. The leadership team determined that strengthening instructional practices related to Target-Task Alignment, Explicit Teaching, Student Discourse and Collaboration, and Monitoring for Learning through Formative Assessment would have the greatest impact on improving student outcomes. These instructional priorities will support teachers in delivering standards-aligned instruction, increasing student engagement, providing timely feedback, and using data to adjust instruction based on student needs.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

For the 2026-27 school year, our goal is to increase ELA proficiency from 67% to 70%, ELA Learning

Gains from 70% to 75%, and ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% subgroup from 79% to 80%. Through collaborative planning, job-embedded professional development, instructional monitoring, and targeted interventions, the school will work to ensure that all students demonstrate measurable growth and achieve at higher levels.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Proficiency levels in each classroom will be monitored through a combination of district-developed module assessments, formative assessments, and standards-based teacher-created assessments. School leadership will regularly review student learning and instructional practices through classroom walkthroughs, as well as formal and informal observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Tony Pleshe

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

John M. Sexton Elementary School will implement evidence-based instructional practices focused on student discourse and collaboration across all grade levels to improve student achievement in English Language Arts and Mathematics. Research demonstrates that structured academic conversations, collaborative learning, and student-centered instructional practices increase student engagement, deepen understanding, strengthen critical thinking skills, and improve academic achievement. Teachers will intentionally incorporate structured opportunities for students to engage in meaningful academic discussions by using complete sentences, academic vocabulary, evidence-based reasoning, and higher-order questioning. Students will participate in collaborative learning experiences where they work cooperatively in pairs and small groups, actively listen to peers, build upon one another's ideas, ask clarifying questions, and provide constructive feedback while sharing responsibility for learning. To support these instructional practices, teachers will implement discussion protocols such as Turn and Talk, Think-Pair-Share, Accountable Talk, collaborative problem-solving, and structured partner discussions. Teachers will model respectful dialogue, provide sentence stems and discussion supports, ask open-ended questions that promote critical thinking, facilitate student-to-student conversations, and monitor collaborative groups to ensure active participation and productive engagement. Implementation of these evidence-based interventions will be monitored through regular classroom walkthroughs, instructional observations, collaborative planning meetings, and Professional Learning Community (PLC) discussions. School leaders and instructional support staff will utilize walkthrough look-fors aligned to student discourse and collaboration, review student work samples, analyze formative assessment and progress monitoring data, and provide timely feedback and coaching to teachers. Student achievement data, classroom observation trends, and collaborative planning artifacts will be reviewed throughout the school year to determine the effectiveness of the interventions and make instructional adjustments as needed to ensure progress

toward the school's measurable outcomes.

Rationale:
John M. Sexton Elementary School selected student discourse and collaboration as evidence-based instructional interventions because research consistently demonstrates that students learn more effectively when they actively engage in meaningful academic conversations, explain their thinking, justify responses with evidence, and collaborate with peers to solve problems. These instructional practices increase student engagement, strengthen critical thinking, improve language development, and deepen conceptual understanding across all content areas. Analysis of schoolwide assessment data and classroom observation data identified opportunities to increase student ownership of learning through higher levels of student engagement and academic discourse. While teachers consistently deliver standards-based instruction, increasing the amount and quality of student-to-student dialogue will provide more opportunities for students to process new learning, articulate their reasoning, and receive immediate feedback from peers and teachers. This is particularly important for students who require additional academic support, English Learners, and students in the Lowest 25% subgroup. These interventions also align with the school's instructional priorities of Target-Task Alignment, Explicit Teaching, Student Discourse and Collaboration, and Monitoring for Learning through Formative Assessment. By creating classrooms where students regularly engage in structured discussions, collaborative problem-solving, and evidence-based reasoning, teachers can more effectively monitor student understanding, identify misconceptions in real time, and adjust instruction to meet student needs. The expected outcome is increased student engagement, stronger academic communication skills, improved critical thinking, and higher levels of achievement and learning gains in English Language Arts and Mathematics. Regular classroom walkthroughs, instructional coaching, collaborative planning, formative assessment data, and progress monitoring will be used to evaluate the fidelity and effectiveness of these interventions and ensure continuous improvement throughout the school year.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Student Discourse and Collaboration

Person Monitoring:
Tony Pleshe, Principal

By When/Frequency:
Every Testing Cycle

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
1. Implement structured student discourse strategies (e.g., Turn and Talk, Think-Pair-Share, Accountable Talk, collaborative problem-solving, and use of sentence stems) in daily ELA and Mathematics instruction to increase student engagement, academic vocabulary, and evidence-based discussions. Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Specialist, Principal, Assistant Principal
2. Strengthen teacher capacity through collaborative planning and professional learning by providing monthly job-embedded professional development focused on facilitating student discourse, collaborative learning structures, higher-order questioning, and effective teacher facilitation techniques. Teachers will analyze student work and share best practices during PLCs.

3. Monitor implementation and student impact through classroom walkthroughs, instructional coaching, PLC discussions, formative assessment data reviews, and progress monitoring. Leadership will provide timely feedback and coaching to ensure consistent implementation of discourse and collaboration strategies and make instructional adjustments based on student outcomes.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

John M. Sexton Elementary School identified Mathematics Achievement and Mathematics Learning Gains in grades 3-5 as a significant Area of Focus for the 2026-2027 school year. Analysis of the 2025-2026 school performance data revealed that mathematics proficiency was 70%, with Mathematics Learning Gains at 61% and Mathematics Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% subgroup at 83%. While overall proficiency exceeded several state benchmarks, student growth data indicated that a substantial number of students were not making the accelerated progress necessary to achieve higher levels of performance and close achievement gaps.

This area of focus directly impacts student learning because mathematical understanding is critical for problem-solving, critical thinking, and success in advanced coursework. Students who develop strong conceptual understanding and mathematical reasoning skills are better prepared to meet grade-level expectations, demonstrate proficiency on state assessments, and apply mathematical thinking across content areas. Improving mathematics achievement and learning gains will help ensure that all students, including those performing below grade level, make meaningful academic progress.

The need for this focus was identified through a review of schoolwide assessment data, progress monitoring results, classroom performance trends, and subgroup achievement data. While overall proficiency remained strong, the Mathematics Learning Gains rate of 61% indicated a need to strengthen instructional practices that support student growth. Data analysis revealed opportunities to improve the alignment between instructional tasks and standards, increase the use of explicit teaching strategies, promote mathematical discourse and student collaboration, and strengthen formative assessment practices to guide instructional decisions.

To address these needs, Sexton Elementary will focus on the school's identified instructional priorities of **Target-Task Alignment, Explicit Teaching, Student Discourse and Collaboration, and Monitoring for Learning through Formative Assessment**. Teachers will engage in collaborative planning, data analysis, and job-embedded professional development designed to improve mathematics instruction and student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

As a result of these efforts, the school has established a goal of increasing Mathematics proficiency from 70% to 75% and Mathematics Learning Gains from 61% to 70% during the 2026-2027 school year. Through targeted instructional support, progress monitoring, and high-quality mathematics instruction, Sexton Elementary will work to ensure that all students demonstrate increased achievement and growth in mathematics.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

The Instructional Leadership Team will monitor through walk throughs and weekly Collaborative Planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Tony Pleshe, Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

John M. Sexton Elementary School will implement evidence-based instructional practices focused on teacher clarity, explicit mathematics instruction, student discourse and collaboration, and monitoring for learning through formative assessment to increase mathematics achievement and learning gains in grades 3–5. Teachers will provide clear learning targets and success criteria aligned to the B.E.S.T. Mathematics Standards, ensuring that instructional tasks are directly aligned to grade-level expectations. Through explicit instruction, teachers will model mathematical concepts using the "I Do, We Do, You Do" instructional framework, provide guided practice with immediate feedback, and gradually release responsibility to students as they demonstrate understanding. Students will engage in structured mathematical discourse by explaining their thinking, justifying solutions using mathematical evidence, asking clarifying questions, and participating in collaborative problem-solving with peers. Teachers will utilize discussion protocols, sentence stems, higher-order questioning, and cooperative learning structures to promote mathematical reasoning and conceptual understanding. Teachers will also use formative assessment strategies throughout instruction, including checks for understanding, exit tickets, student work analysis, classroom questioning, and progress monitoring data to identify misconceptions and adjust instruction in real time. Small-group instruction and targeted interventions will be provided based on student performance data to ensure all students receive the support needed to master grade-level standards. Implementation of these evidence-based interventions will be monitored through regular classroom walkthroughs, instructional observations, collaborative planning meetings, Professional Learning Community (PLC) discussions, and ongoing analysis of formative and summative assessment data. School administrators and the

Curriculum Specialist will use instructional look-fors aligned to teacher clarity, explicit instruction, mathematical discourse, and formative assessment practices to provide coaching and feedback. Student achievement data, district assessments, classroom assessments, and progress monitoring results will be reviewed regularly to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional practices and make data-driven adjustments to improve mathematics achievement and learning gains.

Rationale:
John M. Sexton Elementary School selected teacher clarity, explicit instruction, student discourse and collaboration, and monitoring for learning through formative assessment as the primary evidence-based interventions because research consistently demonstrates that these high-impact instructional practices improve mathematics achievement, conceptual understanding, and student learning gains. Analysis of schoolwide mathematics data revealed that while overall proficiency remains strong, student learning gains indicate a need to accelerate growth for all students, particularly those requiring additional support. Classroom observation data also identified opportunities to strengthen consistent implementation of standards-aligned instruction, increase student engagement through mathematical discourse, and use formative assessment data to make timely instructional adjustments. Teacher clarity ensures students understand the learning target, success criteria, and expectations for mastery. Explicit instruction provides students with clear modeling, guided practice, and immediate feedback, helping them develop a deep understanding of mathematical concepts and procedures. Student discourse and collaboration encourage learners to explain their mathematical thinking, justify solutions with evidence, ask questions, and learn from their peers, leading to stronger reasoning and problem-solving skills. Ongoing formative assessment enables teachers to identify

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Mathematical focus on four instructional look-fors

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Tony Pleshe, Principal	Bi-weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Develop and implement a classroom walkthrough protocol that focuses on four instructional look-fors:
Teacher Clarity: Learning targets and success criteria visible and referenced during instruction
Explicit Instruction: Evidence of "I Do, We Do, You Do" framework and guided practice with feedback
Mathematical Discourse: Student engagement in explaining thinking, justifying solutions, and peer collaboration
Formative Assessment: Use of checks for understanding, questioning, and data-driven adjustments
Conduct walkthroughs bi-weekly during the first semester and monthly thereafter. Follow each walkthrough with brief coaching conversations and written feedback focused on strengths and one area for growth.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

For the 2026–2027 school year, Science instruction in Grade 5 remains a key area of focus. In 2026, 61% of Grade 5 students scored proficient on the FSSA Science Assessment. Based on current trends and instructional efforts, the school is projecting an increase to 70% proficiency in 2027. This area of focus directly impacts student learning by ensuring that science instruction remains rigorous, aligned to standards, and continuously monitored for effectiveness. Over the 2025–2026 academic year, the Instructional Leadership Team, in collaboration with administration, implemented a comprehensive support system that included weekly instructional walkthroughs in grades 3–5, timely feedback to teachers, monthly student data reviews, and collaborative planning sessions. These efforts resulted in notable gains in science achievement. Science remains a priority not due to a lack of progress, but because of the clear evidence that sustained systems, and instructional practices have driven student growth. Maintaining this momentum is essential. The success seen thus far is a direct result of a unified schoolwide commitment to data-informed instruction and ongoing professional collaboration. To build on this foundation, the school will continue its current structure: weekly collaborative planning sessions, monthly grade-level data chats, and frequent administrative walkthroughs. Walkthrough data will be shared with staff and closely monitored in alignment with our School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals to ensure continued progress toward proficiency targets.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

70% of Grade 5 students will score proficient on the FSSA Science Assessment in 2027

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Achievement of this outcome will be monitored through:

- Monthly grade-level data chats reviewing formative and summative assessment results
- Weekly collaborative planning sessions focused on instructional adjustments
- Frequent administrative walkthroughs aligned to science instructional standards

- Regular review of walkthrough data in alignment with School Improvement Plan goals
- Analysis of student work and progress monitoring data to identify and address misconceptions

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Tony Pleshe, Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:
Grade 5 science teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions (60 minutes minimum) facilitated by the Curriculum Specialist and school administration. During these sessions, teachers will: Review grade-level science standards and learning progressions aligned to the Florida B.E.S.T. Science Standards Design and refine instructional units and lessons that incorporate inquiry-based learning, hands-on investigations, and evidence-based science practices Develop formative assessment strategies aligned to learning objectives Plan differentiated instruction and targeted interventions based on student performance data Share effective instructional strategies, resources, and materials Collaboratively analyze student work samples and misconceptions

Rationale:
When all Grade 5 teachers are implementing the same rigorous, standards-aligned, inquiry-based instruction with consistent formative assessment practices, more students master grade-level standards and move toward proficiency on the FSSA Science Assessment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Science Collaborative Planning

Person Monitoring:	**By When/Frequency:**
Tony Pleshe, Principal	Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Review grade-level science standards and learning progressions aligned to the Florida B.E.S.T. Science Standards
Design and refine instructional units and lessons that incorporate inquiry-based learning, hands-on investigations, and evidence-based science practices
Develop formative assessment strategies aligned to learning objectives
Plan differentiated instruction and targeted interventions based on student performance data
Share effective instructional strategies, resources, and materials

Collaboratively analyze student work samples and misconceptions

Area of Focus #4

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Black/African American Students (BLK)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Our primary area of focus for the Black student subgroup is ELA proficiency, specifically improving performance on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.) in grades 3–10. This includes targeted support in foundational reading skills (grades 3–5), reading comprehension and vocabulary development, and critical reading and analytical writing skills

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, we will decrease the ELA proficiency gap between Black and non-Black elementary students by at least 10 percentage points, as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.). Our goal is for at least 70% of Black students to score a Level 3 or higher on the 2027 F.A.S.T. assessment. This goal will be supported by targeted small group instruction and ongoing data monitoring to ensure timely interventions and equitable support.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Instructional leadership teams will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs and formal observations using a consistent look-for tool aligned to small group instruction, differentiated scaffolding, and standards-based ELA instruction. Walkthrough data will specifically track evidence of targeted instruction for Black students, including the use of data-driven small groups, explicit vocabulary instruction, and reading comprehension strategies aligned to B.E.S.T. standards. In addition, PLC agendas and minutes will be reviewed to ensure teams are consistently using student work analysis, planning interventions, and adjusting instruction based on subgroup performance data. Coaching cycles will be documented to support teachers in implementing high-leverage ELA strategies with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Tony Pleshe, Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

John M. Sexton Elementary School will implement evidence-based instructional practices focused on student discourse and collaboration across all grade levels to improve student achievement in English Language Arts and Mathematics. Research demonstrates that structured academic conversations, collaborative learning, and student-centered instructional practices increase student engagement, deepen understanding, strengthen critical thinking skills, and improve academic achievement. Teachers will intentionally incorporate structured opportunities for students to engage in meaningful academic discussions by using complete sentences, academic vocabulary, evidence-based reasoning, and higher-order questioning. Students will participate in collaborative learning experiences where they work cooperatively in pairs and small groups, actively listen to peers, build upon one another's ideas, ask clarifying questions, and provide constructive feedback while sharing responsibility for learning. To support these instructional practices, teachers will implement discussion protocols such as Turn and Talk, Think-Pair-Share, Accountable Talk, collaborative problem-solving, and structured partner discussions. Teachers will model respectful dialogue, provide sentence stems and discussion supports, ask open-ended questions that promote critical thinking, facilitate student-to-student conversations, and monitor collaborative groups to ensure active participation and productive engagement. Implementation of these evidence-based interventions will be monitored through regular classroom walkthroughs, instructional observations, collaborative planning meetings, and Professional Learning Community (PLC) discussions. School leaders and instructional support staff will utilize walkthrough look-fors aligned to student discourse and collaboration, review student work samples, analyze formative assessment and progress monitoring data, and provide timely feedback and coaching to teachers. Student achievement data, classroom observation trends, and collaborative planning artifacts will be reviewed throughout the school year to determine the effectiveness of the interventions and make instructional adjustments as needed to ensure progress toward the school's measurable outcomes.

Rationale:

The rationale for this Area of Focus is to address a persistent and measurable achievement gap in ELA proficiency between Black and non-Black students by ensuring that instructional practices are intentionally targeted, data-driven, and consistently monitored for effectiveness. Disaggregated FAST data indicates that Black students are performing below their peers in ELA proficiency, signaling that general whole-group instruction alone is not sufficient to meet their needs. Without intentional systems of support—such as targeted small group instruction, frequent progress monitoring, and responsive intervention—the gap is likely to persist or widen over time. By focusing on structured small group instruction and ongoing data analysis, the school is able to ensure that instruction is differentiated based on student need rather than delivered uniformly. This increases access to grade-level standards, strengthens foundational reading skills, and provides timely intervention for students who are not yet meeting proficiency expectations.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Closing the ELA Achievement Gap Through Targeted Instruction and Data-Driven Small Groups

Person Monitoring:
Tony Pleshe, Principal

By When/Frequency:
Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

1. Implement targeted small group ELA instruction based on student data
Teachers will use FAST, i-Ready, and classroom formative assessment data to form flexible small groups that specifically target skill gaps in reading comprehension, vocabulary, and foundational literacy skills. Groups will be adjusted regularly based on student progress.
2. Conduct ongoing data cycles and progress monitoring meetings
Grade-level teams will meet on a regular cycle (bi-weekly or after each progress monitoring window) to analyze subgroup data, monitor Black student progress toward proficiency, and adjust instruction and interventions accordingly.

Area of Focus #5

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA required by RAISE (specific questions)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Prioritize the full implementation of the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative in VPK–2 classrooms by ensuring equitable access to resources, including instructional supports, targeted professional development, and ongoing coaching and feedback cycles.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

KG - Will increase from 69% to 75% meeting expectation
1st - Will increase from 75% to 80% meeting expectation
2nd - Will increase from 41% to 65% meeting expectation

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Conduct Regular Classroom Walkthroughs and Observations
• Visit VPK–2 classrooms frequently to look for:
• Use of program materials and lesson components
• Evidence of foundational reading instruction (phonemic awareness, phonics, decoding, etc.)
• Alignment with daily schedules and lesson plans Monitor and Analyze Student Data
• Review data from progress monitoring tools to:
• Track growth in foundational reading skills
• Identify students at risk and in need of intervention
• Evaluate overall program effectiveness
• Hold data chats with teachers to analyze trends and make instructional decisions. Provide Instructional Coaching and Feedback
• Partner with literacy coaches to:
• Deliver professional development aligned with the program
• Observe instruction and provide targeted feedback
• Support teachers with modeling, co-teaching, and resources

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Tony Pleshe

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:
Deliver explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction in a print-rich environment Teach students to decode words, analyze word structure, and build automatic word recognition

Rationale:
To develop literacy, students require instruction in two interconnected areas: foundational reading skills and reading comprehension. By implementing evidence-based strategies and targeted actions, students learn to decode words, connect them to oral language, and read connected text with the accuracy and fluency needed for understanding.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence, Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence, Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3

action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Building Capacity for Early Literacy Excellence

Person Monitoring:
Tony Pleshe

By When/Frequency:
Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
The School Leadership Team meets regularly to analyze student data and make informed decisions about the professional learning and supports needed to drive reading growth. The team actively supports the full implementation of the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative in VPK–2 classrooms. The team works to build instructional capacity by identifying teachers, coaches, and district staff who can lead training efforts that align high-quality instructional materials with evidence-based practices and the B.E.S.T. ELA Benchmarks. The team guides and supports professional development that emphasizes the reciprocal relationship between oral language, collaborative discussion, and writing—helping teachers use these practices to support student thinking, cross-curricular connections, and engagement with complex texts. The team also plans and facilitates family reading nights grounded in accessible, evidence-based strategies to strengthen the connection between home and school literacy efforts.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Positive Behavior and Intervention System (PBIS)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

School attendance is important because it directly impacts a student's academic success and growth. When students attend school regularly, they build strong learning habits, stay connected to their teachers and peers, and avoid falling behind in key skills. Consistent attendance helps create a routine that supports academic achievement and social development. Attendance sets students up for success now and for the future.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

When looking at our 2025-26 schoolwide attendance data, we had a daily average attendance rate of 91.1%, which was an increase from the 2024-2025 school year. Sexton Elementary had 27% of students that missed more than 10% of the school year, and there were 7% of the student population that a chronic attendance issue of more than 20% of the school year. Sexton Elementary will achieve

a daily average attendance rate of 95% for 2026-2027 school year. Sexton Elementary will reduce or number of students who are absent more than 10% of school days by 5%, which would be 22%.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

We will monitor student attendance on a monthly basis. The school guidance counselor and school social worker will work with targeted groups of students who would benefit from an attendance intervention program. The leadership team, instructional coaches and front office staff will monitor the attendance rate of teachers and parents who attend school-wide functions and community events throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Marlene Mazer, Social Worker

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

1. Monitor student absences through the Child Study Team (CST) and make personal phone calls to parents regarding their students' absences. 2. Incentivize students who increase their rate of attendance. 3. Proactively contact parents of students who had attendance issues during the 2026-2027 school year to assist with familial needs. 4. Enforce a policy of no early release for students during the last 30 minutes of the school day. 5. Small group counseling for students with attendance concerns, incentives, mentors and weekly check-in systems will be in place. 6. Incorporate parent incentives to help families get students to class on-time. 7. Increase the number of teacher leaders to spearhead family engagement programs and events schoolwide throughout the year. 8. Monitor attendance of both adults and children who attend our community involved events at the school. 9. Utilize various social media platforms in order for us to advertise school events throughout the year.

Rationale:

Chronic absenteeism also places students at greater risk of dropping out of school, and this early academic exit can carry lifelong consequences, reducing both an individual's employment and earning options far into adulthood.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3

action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Hold bi-weekly CST meetings and share attendance data promptly.

Person Monitoring:
Marlene Mazer

By When/Frequency:
bi-weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Monitor student absences through the CST and make personal phone calls to parents regarding their students' absences. After three absences within a quarter of the school year, the teacher will make a phone call home. After five absences, the school social worker will contact home. After seven absences, the administration team will contact home. Share student attendance data with all teachers and staff. Post attendance data on our school website.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

https://sexton-es.pcsb.org/

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

School Advisory Council (SAC) Meetings: Updates on the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and progress toward goals will be shared and discussed during SAC meetings. Agendas and minutes will be posted on the school website and available upon request.

Annual Title I Meeting: This fall meeting offers families an overview of Title I services, the school's SIP goals, and budget priorities. A family-friendly presentation and printed materials will be provided to ensure clear communication.

Parent Newsletters and Flyers: Monthly newsletters and targeted flyers—both printed and digital—will keep families informed about SIP progress, upcoming actions, and important updates using simple, accessible language.

Parent and Community Resource Station: Located in the front office, this area will feature printed copies of the SIP, the Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP), and additional resources available in multiple languages as needed.

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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 II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

John M. Sexton Elementary School will strengthen its academic program by implementing evidence-based practices aligned to the school's Areas of Focus in English Language Arts and Mathematics. Through collaborative planning, job-embedded professional development, instructional coaching and ongoing data analysis, teachers will deliver high-quality, standards-aligned instruction that meets the diverse needs of all learners. The school will continue to emphasize teacher clarity, explicit instruction, student discourse and collaboration and monitoring for learning through formative assessment to improve student achievement and learning gains.

To increase both the amount of time and quality of learning time, teachers will maximize instructional minutes through purposeful planning, clearly defined learning targets and effective classroom routines. Students identified through progress monitoring as needing additional support will receive targeted small-group instruction, intervention and enrichment opportunities during the instructional day. Teachers will regularly analyze formative and summative assessment data to adjust instruction, provide timely feedback and ensure students receive interventions or enrichment based on individual learning needs.

The school will provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum by engaging students in rigorous, standards-based learning experiences that promote critical thinking, problem solving, collaboration and academic discourse. Students will participate in differentiated learning opportunities that encourage them to explain their thinking, justify responses using evidence, and apply their knowledge to real-world situations. Teachers will utilize high-quality instructional materials, technology resources and collaborative learning structures to deepen student understanding and increase engagement. Implementation of these strategies will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, instructional observations, collaborative planning and progress monitoring.

How Plan is Developed

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 this Act, 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) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) at Sexton Elementary is developed in partnership with key stakeholders and aligns with federal, state, and local initiatives to support the whole child. Our coordinated efforts include:

Federal Programs: Title I funding provides full-day PreK-3 instruction, an MTSS Coach, and additional intervention staff to support academic growth.
Student Services & Mental Health Support: We collaborate with the district's student services team, school counselors, and community mental health agencies to meet the emotional and behavioral needs of our students.
Violence Prevention & PBIS: Our Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) program reinforces schoolwide expectations through behavior assemblies, restorative practices, and consistent support systems. Nutrition Services: In coordination with the district's Food and Nutrition Department, all students receive free breakfast and lunch daily to support healthy learning.
College & Career Readiness: Through community outreach and early exposure activities, we help students build awareness and readiness for future college and career opportunities.

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

1. School Counseling and Mental Health Services • Certified School Counselors provide individual and group counseling sessions focused on conflict resolution, self-regulation, and college/career readiness.
• Regular Needs Assessments are conducted to identify students requiring additional mental health support, with referrals made promptly through a coordinated support system.
2. Specialized Support Services
• Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS): The school uses an MTSS framework to provide differentiated behavioral and emotional interventions based on student needs.
• Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs) and Functional Behavioral Assessments (FBAs) are developed for students demonstrating significant behavioral challenges.
• Social Workers and School Psychologists work collaboratively with families and teachers to support student mental and emotional health, home-life challenges, and community connections.
3. Mentoring Programs
• Adult Mentoring: The school facilitates structured mentoring programs where students are matched with trusted adults to foster goal setting, motivation, and positive identity development.
• Community Partnerships: Local organizations and business leaders may serve as mentors, especially for at-risk or underrepresented students.

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

To ensure all students are well-prepared for college, career, and life beyond high school, the school provides a range of supports and programs that increase awareness of postsecondary pathways and equip students with the academic, technical, and employability skills needed for future success.

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

Tier 1 – Universal Prevention (All Students) Strategies:
• Implement schoolwide behavior expectations (e.g., Respect, Responsibility, Readiness).
• Use consistent behavior management practices in every classroom. Monitoring:
• Collect office discipline referral data and school climate surveys.
• Use universal behavior screeners to identify students at risk. Alignment with IDEA:
• Although Tier 1 is for all students, it lays the foundation for inclusive practices that benefit students with disabilities and helps identify students needing additional support.

Tier 2 – Targeted Interventions (Some Students) Strategies:
• Provide small group interventions (e.g., Check-In/Check-Out, social skills groups).
• Use behavior contracts and progress monitoring tools. Monitoring:
• Track student progress through weekly data reviews (attendance, ODRs, intervention logs).

Legal Coordination:
• For students not identified under IDEA, this tier serves as early intervening services to address behavior before referral.
• For students with IEPs, coordinate Tier 2 supports with IEP goals as appropriate.
Tier 3 – Intensive Interventions (Few Students) Strategies:
• Develop individualized behavior intervention plans based on Functional Behavior Assessments (FBAs).
• Provide wraparound supports (mental health counseling, mentoring).
Monitoring:
• Use intensive data collection and frequent team meetings (e.g., weekly).
• Monitor fidelity of implementation and responsiveness to intervention.

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

Job-embedded coaching focused on literacy, mathematics, and differentiated instruction.
Collaborative planning time for grade-level teams and PLCs (Professional Learning Communities).

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

Host “Kindergarten Readiness” nights for preschool families to visit the elementary school, meet staff, and tour classrooms.
Provide transition packets with school readiness tips, kindergarten expectations, and developmental milestones

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI, or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2026-27 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply. **No**

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00