

Pinellas County Schools

SHORE ACRES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2026-27 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 2
 - A. School Mission and Vision 2
 - B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2
 - C. Demographic Data..... 6
 - D. Early Warning Systems 7
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 11
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 12
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 13
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 14
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 15
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 18
- III. Planning for Improvement..... 19
- IV. Positive Learning Environment 29
- V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 31
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 34
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 35

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

To provide a rigorous educational program to prepare students to be life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement

Succeed Achieve Educate 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

Kris Sulte

sultek@pcsb.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Instructional Leader

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Kristin Waechter

waechterk@pcsb.org

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

SIP Development and Implementation

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Barbara Lewis

lewisba@pcsb.org

Position Title

Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

SIP Development and Implementation

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Chelsea Sharp

masseyc@pcsb.org

Position Title

Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

SIP development and Implementation

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Janson Karst

karstj@pcsb.org

Position Title

Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

SIP development and Implementation

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Lisa Eddings

eddingsl@pcsb.org

Position Title

Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

SIP development and Implementation

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Mariel Kiefel

kiefelm@pcsb.org

Position Title

Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

SIP development and Implementation

Leadership Team Member #8

Employee's Name

Robyn DeCresie

decresier@pcsb.org

Position Title

Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

SIP development and Implementation

Leadership Team Member #9

Employee's Name

Ada Gierlak- Teacher

gierlaka@pcsb.org

Position Title

Job Duties and Responsibilities

SIP development and Implementation

Leadership Team Member #10

Employee's Name

Christine Marr

marrc@pcsb.org

Position Title

Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

SIP development and Implementation

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.

Prior to the end of the previous school year teachers review data, brainstorm barriers and strategies to implement toward 100% student achievement. All staff looked at their individual Math and ELA data by sub groups to determine action steps. Draft SIP is shared with SAC for additions, clarifications and approval.

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 is monitored after each Progress Monitoring Cycle with individual grade level teams. If necessary additional actions steps may be added to SIP. SIP is also reviewed with SAC after each progress monitoring cycle.

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	49.0%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
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 <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2025-26: A 2024-25: A 2023-24: A 2022-23: A 2021-22: A

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	71	92	85	112	110	105	0	0	0	575
Absent 10% or more school days	0	19	5	12	12	14	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	6	16	4	9	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	4	6	18	5	8	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)			1	6	1	0				8
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)			2	5						7

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	0	4	5	14	6	7	0	0	0	36

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	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	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	65	97	108	109	112	116				607
Absent 10% or more school days		18	17	18	17	12				82
One or more suspensions				1						1
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)										0
Course failure in Math						1				1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				5	13					18
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment		5	11	11	8	8				43
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

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		3	5	7	6	5				26

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				1						1
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 CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2026			2025			2024		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]	SCHOOL	DISTRICT [†]	STATE [†]
ELA Achievement*	78	68	62	74	64	59	73	61	57
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	86	70	61	79	67	59	78	63	58
ELA Learning Gains	67	65	63	54	62	60	64	64	60
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65	63	58	51	59	56	62	62	57
Math Achievement*	83	72	66	78	69	64	77	66	62
Math Learning Gains	79	69	64	72	67	63	82	68	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63	56	50	54	56	51	64	58	52
Science Achievement	76	72	62	83	70	58	77	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	597
Total Components for the FPPI	8
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2025-26	2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*
75%	67%	74%	68%	65%	46%	

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	62%	No		
English Language Learners	62%	No		
Asian Students	90%	No		
Black/African American Students	61%	No		
Hispanic Students	74%	No		
Multiracial Students	83%	No		
White Students	76%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	65%	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	78%	86%	67%	65%	83%	79%	63%	76%					
Students With Disabilities	46%	64%	62%	69%	56%	73%	71%	53%					
English Language Learners	47%		33%		87%	82%							
Asian Students	80%				100%								
Black/African American Students	61%	75%	59%	45%	61%	68%	58%	64%					
Hispanic Students	72%	88%	56%	67%	85%	82%	71%	72%					
Multiracial Students	83%		75%		83%	92%							
White Students	82%	88%	71%	69%	86%	78%	54%	78%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	62%	68%	57%	62%	70%	67%	62%	68%					

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	74%	79%	54%	51%	78%	72%	54%	83%					57%
Students With Disabilities	45%	64%	45%	47%	33%	54%	50%	47%					
English Language Learners	50%				58%								57%
Asian Students	83%				92%								
Black/African American Students	44%	40%	53%		41%	71%							
Hispanic Students	71%	83%	53%	64%	73%	65%	64%	80%					60%
Multiracial Students	75%				75%								
White Students	78%	84%	53%	41%	84%	74%	46%	91%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	66%	71%	53%	50%	65%	68%	52%	78%					50%

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	73%	78%	64%	62%	77%	82%	64%	77%		85%
Students With Disabilities	37%	56%	38%	33%	38%	77%	64%			
English Language Learners										85%
Asian Students	80%				80%					
Black/African American Students	35%		30%		38%					
Hispanic Students	69%	67%	61%		79%	93%				83%
White Students	78%	81%	70%	67%	81%	84%	71%	84%		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	56%	63%	54%	63%	68%	80%	67%	72%		

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	84%	68%	16%	60%	24%
ELA	4	73%	66%	7%	60%	13%
ELA	5	71%	66%	5%	61%	10%
Math	3	87%	71%	16%	66%	21%
Math	4	83%	72%	11%	65%	18%
Math	5	75%	69%	6%	62%	13%
Science	5	74%	70%	4%	60%	14%

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?

Our ELA proficiency, learning gains for all and our L 25 all showed a marked increase. A focused effort on collaboration and planning were actions that contributed to our success. A focused effort in primary grades with data driven small groups lead to increased proficiency in the upper grades. Our Math Learning Gains for our L25 students also showed a sharp increase. Need to continue to analyze data in both ELA and Math, focus efforts in each grade level for our Level 2 and ESE students to ensure they are monitoring what they are reading. This will lead to increased student achievement. Our black subgroup increased in ELA and Math Proficiency to 61% in both areas.

Lowest Performance

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

Our Science Proficiency score decreased by 7 points. Science is always given to a different group of students each year. The 76% is in line with their Reading Proficiency.

Greatest Decline

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

Our Science score was the only thing that declined. A new group of students with less ELA proficiency contributed to the decline.

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.

While our data out performs all the state averages- Our ESE subgroups data compared with whole school data still shows a gap. The level of student and parent engagement as well as teacher monitoring with timely feedback are factors that may have contributed to the gap.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Attendance continues to be a focus for our school. Students can't engage in the learning when not

present. We did do better this year with our number of students missing 10% or more.

Highest Priorities

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

Closing the achievement gap of our Black and ESE students.

Returning our Science Proficiency to over 80%.

Focusing efforts on students who are Level 2 after PM 2 to ensure academic success.

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.

Our ELA Proficiency increased from 73% to 79%. Our Learning Gains went from 69% to 67% and for our L25, gains went from 49% to 64%. Our proficiency continues to increase through the implementation of small groups to deepen students understanding of the benchmark and through collaboration of the content and data analysis by teachers. As a school we need to focus our efforts on Level 2 students and implement strategies that will build stamina and ensure they can analyze text.

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 25-26 school year: Shore Acres students were 79% proficient, 67% had learning gains, 64% of our L25 had learning gains and 85% of 3rd grade were proficient on FAST.

For 26-27 school year:

80% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient on PM 3 ELA FAST.

75% of students in grades 4-5 will show growth based on PM 3 ELA FAST.

75% of the lowest performing students in grades 4-5 will show growth based on PM 3 ELA FAST.

86% of students in grade 3 will be proficient on PM 3 ELA FAST

70% of our 4th and 5th grade ESE students will show growth based on PM 3 ELA FAST

70% of our ESE students will be proficient on PM 3 ELA FAST.

95% of students in K will be proficient on STAR Assessment.

90% of 1st graders will be proficient on STAR Assessment.

80% of 2nd graders will be proficient on STAR Assessment.

In grades K-2 100% of students will increase their running record by four levels or meet/exceed the district expectations.

Monitoring

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

Monitoring towards outcome will occur after each Progress Monitoring cycle with all grade levels. Administration will also share progress towards desired outcome to SAC.

Students identified as L25/ESE will have district module assessments monitored and analyzed so that remediation can occur.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

K.Sulte-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:

Engage our students in more complex thinking along with strategies to analyze text to help to improve student achievement.

Rationale:

As teachers become more skilled in this strategy, they will see remarkable changes in students' abilities to process and understand new content because they are able to identify which content is critical and understand how learned content scaffolds in complexity. A classroom of scholars identifies critical content within standards, but also studies, recognizes, and celebrates as knowledge grows increasingly more sophisticated.

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

Use district PCS Modules curriculum to provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in in complex, grade-level content, knowledge-building, and tasks aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark; and make strategic decisions about implementation of the curriculum to maximize impact on student learning. Focus on 5 Essentials of Effective Instruction during Collaborative Planning for implementation.

Person Monitoring:

K.Sulte

By When/Frequency:

After each district assessment and FAST PM cycle

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

Teams will meet as groups and individuals after each PM cycle to determine areas of need. Action plans will be developed and monitored using district module assessments. Students will be identified as needing remediation will receive this through push in support during core instruction or intervention block.

Action Step #2

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

Person Monitoring:

K. Sulte

By When/Frequency:

After each district assessment and FAST PM cycle

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

Teams will meet as groups and individuals after each PM cycle to determine areas of need. Action plans will be developed and monitored using district module assessments. Students will be identified as needing remediation will receive this through push in support during core instruction or intervention block.

Action Step #3

Ensure teachers integrate phonological awareness, phonics, word study and spelling, fluency, vocabulary and text comprehension strategies into an explicit, systematic and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies

Person Monitoring:

K. Sulte

By When/Frequency:

Monthly at PLC and Collaborative Planning

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

Teachers will meet monthly at PLC and Collaborative Planning to analyze running record and ELFAC data to determine whole and small group instruction needs to support foundational skills of our students. Interventionists will be provided timely information about students to remediate the deficits.

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.

For the 25-26 school year we had 78% of our students reaching proficiency. This was an increase from the previous year. Utilizing district curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students with a focus on our L25 students is an area

of focus. By shifting from Routine tasks to Reasoning tasks, students are engaged in high-cognitive-demand tasks with multiple solution pathways. Effective teaching of mathematics engages students in solving and discussing tasks that promote mathematical reasoning and problem solving and allow multiple entry points and varied solution strategies.

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.

85% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient on PM 3 of MATH FAST.

80% of students in grades 4-5 will show growth based on PM 3 of MATH FAST.

80% of the lowest performing students in grades 4-5 will show growth based on PM 3 of MATH FAST.

70% of our 4th and 5th grade ESE and Black students will show growth based on PM 3 MATH FAST

70% of our ESE and Black students will be proficient on PM 3 MATH FAST.

85% of students in Kindergarten will be proficient on PM 3 of MATH FAST.

85% of students in 1st grade will be proficient on PM 3 of MATH FAST.

85% of students in 2nd grade will be proficient on PM 3 of MATH FAST.

Monitoring

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

Monitoring towards outcome will occur after each Progress Monitoring cycle with all grade levels.

Administration will also share progress towards desired outcome to SAC. We will also monitor after each Math unit assessment to plan for remediation and acceleration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

K. Waechter- AP

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:

Utilize district curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned rigorous expectations for all students. Focus on implementation of the 5 Essentials for Effective Instruction.

Rationale:

By shifting from Routine tasks to Reasoning tasks, students are engaged in high-cognitive-demand tasks with multiple solution pathways. Effective teaching of mathematics engages students in solving and discussing tasks that promote mathematical reasoning and problem solving and allow multiple entry points and varied solution strategies.

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

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction and intervention, based on data, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced tasks for students above benchmark.

Person Monitoring:

K. Waechter

By When/Frequency:

After each district assessment and FAST PM cycle

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

Teachers will meet after each district math assessment to analyze data and action plan for remediation through spiral review and small groups. Teachers will also monitor after each PM cycle to plan for instruction and remediation.

Action Step #2

Employ instructional practices and routines that promote student-centered learning (Higher-Order Questioning, Pinellas Problem Solving Routine, Play-Explore-Investigate (PEI) Routine, Number Sense Making Routines, Collaborative structures, High-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback). Continue the use of REFLEX math for basic facts.

Person Monitoring:

K. Waechter

By When/Frequency:

After each district assessment and FAST PM cycle

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

Teachers will meet after each district math assessment to analyze data and action plan for remediation through spiral review and small groups. Teachers will also monitor after each PM cycle to plan for instruction and remediation.

Action Step #3

Teachers and administrators engage in Common Planning (during or after school) to incorporate Writing to Learn Strategies and plan for Academic Discourse opportunities within the math block to strengthen students understanding of math concepts.

Person Monitoring:

K. Waechter

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

Teachers will use Thursday as a Collaborative Planning time for math planning. Data from District assessments will be analyzed after each unit to monitor the impact.

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.

Utilize district curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students. It is imperative that there is intention planning and the use of time; determining how students are going to perform and what they will need to perform well.

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.

80% of students in grade 5 will score a level 3 on Florida's State Academic Standards for Science or FSASS.

Monitoring

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

District Science Assessments will be analyzed for desired outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

K. Sulte

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:

Deepen the understanding of the Florida's State Academic Standards for Science as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes A focus on Writing to Learn Strategies and planned Academic Discourse opportunities to impact student performance.

Rationale:

When planning teachers will focus on the following: Planning and Predicting: It is imperative that there is intention planning and the use of time; determining how students are going to perform and what they will need to perform well. They will also plan for classroom discussion as a method of teaching, that involves the entire class in a discussion. The teacher stops lecturing and students get together as a class to discuss an important issue. Classroom discussion allows students to improve communication skills by voicing their opinions and thoughts. Teachers also benefit from classroom discussion as it allows them to see if students have learnt the concepts that are being taught. Moreover, a classroom discussion creates an environment where everyone learns from each other.

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

During collaborative planning, make strategic decisions about implementation of the curriculum to maximize impact on student learning, including use of collaborative structures for high-level engagement tasks, incorporate writing to learn strategies and plan for academic discourse.

Person Monitoring:

K.Sulte

By When/Frequency:

After each district assessment

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

After each District Science Assessment teams will discuss and analyze student data to determine actions steps effectiveness

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.

Based on the 25-26 FAST Assessment 61% of our Black students met proficiency in ELA. 59% of those in 4th and 5th grade made a learning gain and 45% of our L25 made a learning gain. We need to ensure that instructional supports are in place for our Black students during core instruction and independence as well as extensions and more advanced texts for student above the benchmark. These supports include access to grade level text as well as small group instruction based on data.

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 Black students will be proficient on ELA PM 3 FAST.

70% of our 4th and 5th graders will make a learning gain based on ELA PM 3 FAST.

70% of our L 25 students will make a learning gain based on ELA PM 3 FAST.

Monitoring

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

Data from District Assessments including running records, core phonics survey and end of module assessments will be analyzed and acted upon through remediation in small groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

K.Sulte

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:

Ensure whole group and small group instruction in the ELA block in both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to evidence-based principles.

Rationale:

Explicit instructional practice for novices in learning new content, skill, or concept: 1) full, clear explanations, 2) teacher modeling, 3) Provide a "worked-out" sample with full teacher explanation, 3) Full guidance during student practice, 4) Teacher corrective feedback. Decades of research clearly demonstrate that for novices (comprising virtually all students), direct, explicit instruction is more effective and more efficient than partial guidance. Teachers are more effective when providing explicit guidance with practice and feedback rather than requiring student discovery while learning new skills/ concepts. A review of 70 studies indicates that failure to provide strong instructional support produced measurable loss of learning: minimal guidance can increase the achievement gap. Differentiation consists of the efforts of teachers to respond to variance among learners in the classroom. Whenever a teacher reaches out to an individual or small group to vary his or her teaching in order to create the best learning experience possible, that teacher is differentiating instruction. Teachers can differentiate at least four classroom elements based on student readiness, interest, or learning profile: (1) content—what the student needs to learn or how the student will get access to the information; (2) process—activities in which the student engages in order to make sense of or master the content; (3) products—culminating projects that ask the student to rehearse, apply, and extend what he or she has learned in a unit; and (4) learning environment—the way the classroom works and feels. The most important factor in differentiation that helps students achieve more and feel more engaged in school is being sure that what teachers differentiate is high-quality curriculum and instruction. For example, teachers can make sure that: (1) curriculum is clearly focused on the information and understandings that are most valued by an expert in a particular discipline; (2) lessons, activities, and products are designed to ensure that students grapple with, use, and come to understand those essentials; (3) materials and tasks are interesting to students and seem relevant to them; (4) learning is active; and (5) there is joy and satisfaction in learning for each student.

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

Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.

Person Monitoring:

K.Sulte

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

Identified students in all grades will have their data monitored monthly by SBLT and with identified teachers. Action Plans will be implemented for skill attainment.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

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.

Based on a review of our EWS data, student attendance is an area that needs to be addressed. For the 25-26 school year 12% of students missed 10% or more of school which impacts student achievement.

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.

10% of students will miss 10% of school or less for the 26-27 school year.

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.

Child Study Team(CST) will meet twice a month to review data and plan for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Tara Saraceno- 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:

A yearlong campaign to educate families and notify them of absences will be implemented.

Rationale:

The lack of school attendance is a family issue so a focus on educating families needs to occur in order for an improvement in attendance.

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

Distribute first day attendance packets to all families to include: Tier 1 process for improving student attendance

Person Monitoring:

T. Saraceno

By When/Frequency:

August

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

Students missing 10% or more of school will be monitored monthly.

Action Step #2

Tier 2: Bi Weekly CST meetings to include- phone calls, letters, emails and in person follow up of families missing 10% or more of school.

Person Monitoring:

T. Saraceno

By When/Frequency:

Biweekly CST Meetings.

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

Individual student action plans will be reviewed to determine effectiveness.

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.

Not a Title One School

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)).

No Answer Entered

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)).

No Answer Entered

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)).

No Answer Entered

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)).

Not a Title One School

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)).

No Answer Entered

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)).

No Answer Entered

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)).

No Answer Entered

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)).

No Answer Entered

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.

Student data is used to identify deficits. Interventions are matched to identified standards to remediate towards proficiency.

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).

Use of FAST and ELFAC data in August and September for students in grades K-5.

Students in grades K-2 are identified based on skill deficits. Students are remediated in the classroom and with interventionist. Skill is assessed and we move to the next skill.

Student in grades 3-5 are pulled in small groups using a push in model. Skills are identified using FAST and assessed using district assessments.

Student data is reviewed at PLC and SBLT to monitor progress toward proficiency.

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