

Pinellas County Schools

# PINELLAS PARK ELEMENTARY SCHL



## 2025-26 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 ..... 10

    A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison ..... 11

    B. ESSA School-Level Data Review ..... 12

    C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review ..... 13

    D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 14

    E. Grade Level Data Review ..... 17

III. Planning for Improvement..... 18

IV. Positive Learning Environment ..... 26

V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 29

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

---

All stakeholders will work together in a cooperative partnership which will enable our students to become college and career ready. Together we will provide a balanced curriculum which is driven by data and based on individual student needs.

### Provide the school's vision statement

---

As a community, we will provide the necessary support to all students, so they are college and career ready, reaching the highest level of achievement.

## 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

Aaron McWilliams

mcwilliamsa@pcsb.org

##### Position Title

Principal

##### Job Duties and Responsibilities

---

Monitor the implementation of the plan with fidelity.

#### Leadership Team Member #2

##### Employee's Name

Karris Cooper

cooperkar@pcsb.org

**Position Title**

Assistant Principal

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

---

Monitor fidelity of plan and support implementation.

**Leadership Team Member #3**

**Employee's Name**

Anca Irimie

irimiea@pcsb.org

**Position Title**

Reading Coach

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

---

Develop Steps to the plan and support with monitoring the plan.

**Leadership Team Member #4**

**Employee's Name**

Katherine Preu

preuk@pcsb.org

**Position Title**

Math Coach

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

---

Develop Steps to the plan and support with monitoring the plan.

**Leadership Team Member #5**

**Employee's Name**

Denise Steele

steeled@pcsb.org

**Position Title**

PELI Coach

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

---

Develop Steps to the plan and support with monitoring the plan.

## Leadership Team Member #6

### Employee's Name

Kathryn Nartker

nartkerk@pcsb.org

### Position Title

MTSS Coach

### Job Duties and Responsibilities

---

Develop Steps to the plan and support with monitoring the plan.

## Leadership Team Member #7

### Employee's Name

Kathryn Musuraca

musuracak@pcsb.org

### Position Title

Kindergarten Team Lead

### Job Duties and Responsibilities

---

Develop Steps to the plan and support with monitoring the plan.

## 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.*

---

Monthly Meetings (SAC) that share these strategies and monitor if they are evident, using checklist and look-fors specifically related to the action items supporting the goals established in the plan, surveys to all community stakeholders; formation of a PTA.

## 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)).

---

The SIP plan will be reviewed monthly during staff meetings, PLC's, and discussed during the SAC Meetings. Action items will be reviewed with the Leadership Team.

## C. Demographic Data

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2025-26 STATUS</b><br>(PER MSID FILE)   | <b>ACTIVE</b>   |
| <b>SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED</b><br>(PER MSID FILE)  | <b>ELEMENTARY<br/>KG-5</b>  |
| <b>PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE</b><br>(PER MSID FILE)   | <b>K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION</b>   |
| <b>2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS</b>   | <b>YES</b>  |
| <b>2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE</b>   | <b>100.0%</b>   |
| <b>CHARTER SCHOOL</b>  | <b>NO</b>   |
| <b>RAISE SCHOOL</b>  | <b>YES</b>  |
| <b>2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION</b><br>*UPDATED AS OF 1   | <b>CSI</b>  |
| <b>ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)</b>  |   |
| <b>2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED</b><br>(SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS)<br>(SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK) | <b>STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)*</b><br><b>ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)</b><br><b>ASIAN STUDENTS (ASN)</b><br><b>BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK)*</b><br><b>HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP)</b><br><b>MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL)*</b><br><b>WHITE STUDENTS (WHT)</b><br><b>ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)</b> |
| <b>SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY</b><br><i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>   | <b>2024-25: C</b><br><b>2023-24: C</b><br><b>2022-23: D</b><br><b>2021-22: C</b><br><b>2020-21: C</b>   |



## D. Early Warning Systems

### 1. Grades K-8

#### Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 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   | 44          | 55 | 61 | 76 | 66 | 79 |   |   |   | 381   |
| Absent 10% or more school days  | 0           | 18 | 21 | 23 | 21 | 26 |   |   |   | 109   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 2  | 11 | 7  | 14 | 17 |   |   |   | 51    |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 8  | 3  |   |   |   | 14    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 7  | 1  |   |   |   | 10    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 3  | 29 | 50 | 28 | 0  |   |   |   | 110   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 6  | 10 | 33 | 23 | 26 |   |   |   | 98    |
| 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           | 1  | 8  | 14 | 8  | 0  |   |   |   | 31    |
| Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)          | 0           | 3  | 5  | 13 | 13 | 0  |   |   |   | 34    |

#### Current Year 2025-26

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

| INDICATOR                            | GRADE LEVEL |   |   |    |    |    |   |   |   | TOTAL |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 5 | 9 | 22 | 28 | 33 |   |   |   | 97    |

#### Current Year 2025-26

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           | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |   |   |   | 11    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |   |   |   | 3     |

**Prior Year (2024-25) 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 |       |
| Absent 10% or more school days  |             | 20 | 30 | 36 | 27 | 18 |   |   |   | 131   |
| One or more suspensions   |             | 2  | 2  | 12 | 6  | 5  |   |   |   | 27    |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   |             |    |    | 7  |    | 4  |   |   |   | 11    |
| Course failure in Math  |             |    |    | 2  |    | 1  |   |   |   | 3     |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   |             |    |    | 7  | 31 | 32 |   |   |   | 70    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  |             |    |    | 6  | 31 | 33 |   |   |   | 70    |
| 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 (2024-25) 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 |             | 4 | 2 | 13 | 27 | 20 |   |   |   | 66    |

**Prior Year (2024-25) 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     |             |   |   | 7 |   |   |   |   |   | 7     |
| Students retained two or more times |             |   | 1 | 2 |   |   |   |   |   | 3     |

## 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 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

| ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT   | 2025   |           |        | 2024   |           |        | 2023** |           |
|--|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|
|  | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† |
| ELA Achievement*   | 35     | 64        | 59     | 30     | 61        | 57     | 28     | 54        |
| Grade 3 ELA Achievement  | 37     | 67        | 59     | 30     | 63        | 58     | 27     | 54        |
| ELA Learning Gains   | 54     | 62        | 60     | 52     | 64        | 60     |        |           |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile                                       | 72     | 59        | 56     | 78     | 62        | 57     |        |           |
| Math Achievement*  | 39     | 69        | 64     | 31     | 66        | 62     | 28     | 61        |
| Math Learning Gains  | 59     | 67        | 63     | 50     | 68        | 62     |        |           |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile                                      | 64     | 56        | 51     | 57     | 58        | 52     |        |           |
| Science Achievement  | 38     | 70        | 58     | 33     | 69        | 57     | 34     | 62        |
| Social Studies Achievement*                                      |        |           | 92     |        |           |        |        | 54        |
| Graduation Rate  |        |           |        |        |           |        |        |           |
| Middle School Acceleration                                       |        |           |        |        |           |        |        |           |
| College and Career Acceleration                                  |        |           |        |        |           |        |        |           |
| Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) | 55     | 67        | 63     | 49     | 65        | 61     | 27     | 64        |

\*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)

| 2024-25 ESSA FPPI                            |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)             | CSI |
| OVERALL FPPI – All Students                  | 50% |
| OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students        | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3   |
| Total Points Earned for the FPPI             | 453 |
| Total Components for the FPPI                | 9   |
| Percent Tested                               | 97% |
| Graduation Rate                              |     |

| ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY |         |         |         |           |          |         |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|----------|---------|
| 2024-25                   | 2023-24 | 2022-23 | 2021-22 | 2020-21** | 2019-20* | 2018-19 |
| 50%                       | 46%     | 37%     | 53%     | 47%       |          | 51%     |

\* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

\*\* Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2024-25 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          | 36%                             | Yes                | 6   |   |
| English Language Learners           | 45%                             | No                 |   |   |
| Asian Students                      | 55%                             | No                 |   |   |
| Black/African American Students     | 34%                             | Yes                | 6   |   |
| Hispanic Students                   | 50%                             | No                 |   |   |
| Multiracial Students                | 40%                             | Yes                | 1   |   |
| White Students                      | 53%                             | No                 |   |   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 50%                             | 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.

| 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                                   | 35%      | 37%              | 54%    | 72%         | 39%       | 59%     | 64%          | 38%      |         |           |                   |                   | 55%          |
| Students With Disabilities                     | 16%      | 10%              | 53%    | 79%         | 14%       | 31%     | 53%          | 27%      |         |           |                   |                   | 40%          |
| English Language Learners                      | 27%      | 25%              | 59%    | 60%         | 36%       | 58%     | 60%          | 29%      |         |           |                   |                   | 55%          |
| Asian Students                                 | 45%      |                  | 58%    |             | 60%       | 68%     |              |          |         |           |                   |                   | 42%          |
| Black/African American Students                | 23%      | 20%              | 52%    |             | 31%       | 44%     |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Hispanic Students                              | 35%      | 42%              | 54%    |             | 37%       | 62%     | 73%          | 33%      |         |           |                   |                   | 61%          |
| Multiracial Students                           | 40%      |                  |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| White Students                                 | 39%      | 48%              | 49%    |             | 36%       | 62%     | 91%          | 44%      |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students            | 35%      | 35%              | 52%    | 75%         | 38%       | 58%     | 63%          | 38%      |         |           |                   |                   | 57%          |



| 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                                   | 30%      | 30%              | 52%    | 78%         | 31%       | 50%     | 57%          | 33%      |         |           |                   |                   | 49%          |
| Students With Disabilities                     | 8%       | 0%               | 58%    | 83%         | 5%        | 38%     | 58%          | 0%       |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| English Language Learners                      | 27%      | 27%              | 60%    |             | 35%       | 53%     |              | 17%      |         |           |                   |                   | 49%          |
| Asian Students                                 | 55%      | 50%              | 64%    |             | 68%       | 64%     |              |          |         |           |                   |                   | 80%          |
| Black/African American Students                | 16%      | 22%              | 37%    | 64%         | 20%       | 41%     | 50%          | 8%       |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Hispanic Students                              | 24%      | 18%              | 54%    | 90%         | 20%       | 43%     |              | 29%      |         |           |                   |                   | 46%          |
| Multiracial Students                           | 36%      |                  |        |             | 45%       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| White Students                                 | 35%      | 28%              | 58%    |             | 31%       | 58%     |              | 70%      |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students            | 27%      | 29%              | 48%    | 68%         | 27%       | 48%     | 57%          | 29%      |         |           |                   |                   | 40%          |

| 2022-23 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 2021-22 | C&C ACCEL 2021-22 | ELP PROGRESS |
| All Students                                   | 28%      | 27%              |        |             | 28%       |         |              | 34%      |         |           |                   |                   | 27%          |
| Students With Disabilities                     | 9%       | 20%              |        |             | 11%       |         |              | 7%       |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| English Language Learners                      | 15%      | 20%              |        |             | 26%       |         |              | 9%       |         |           |                   |                   | 67%          |
| Asian Students                                 | 56%      |                  |        |             | 38%       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Black/African American Students                | 16%      | 18%              |        |             | 16%       |         |              | 31%      |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Hispanic Students                              | 23%      | 21%              |        |             | 31%       |         |              | 44%      |         |           |                   |                   | 77%          |
| Multiracial Students                           | 42%      |                  |        |             | 25%       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| White Students                                 | 30%      | 22%              |        |             | 33%       |         |              | 31%      |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students            | 25%      | 26%              |        |             | 26%       |         |              | 30%      |         |           |                   |                   | 67%          |

## 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.

| 2024-25 SPRING |       |        |          |                   |       |                |
|----------------|-------|--------|----------|-------------------|-------|----------------|
| SUBJECT        | GRADE | SCHOOL | DISTRICT | SCHOOL - DISTRICT | STATE | SCHOOL - STATE |
| ELA            | 3     | 31%    | 65%      | -34%              | 57%   | -26%           |
| ELA            | 4     | 33%    | 62%      | -29%              | 56%   | -23%           |
| ELA            | 5     | 30%    | 61%      | -31%              | 56%   | -26%           |
| Math           | 3     | 37%    | 68%      | -31%              | 63%   | -26%           |
| Math           | 4     | 47%    | 68%      | -21%              | 62%   | -15%           |
| Math           | 5     | 27%    | 65%      | -38%              | 57%   | -30%           |
| Science        | 5     | 34%    | 67%      | -33%              | 55%   | -21%           |

### 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 Asian population, which represents 10% of our overall campus population, performed at 65% in math, which exceeds the state average of 58%. Inclusive efforts with staffing and targeted measures achieved improved results.

##### **Lowest Performance**

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

---

The data components showed that the lowest performance was in the SWD (15%) and African American (22%) versus 35% overall student average. Small groups were not met with fidelity and rigor was lost in classroom lessons.

##### **Greatest Decline**

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

---

SWD's (15%) and ESOL (19%) students for ELA proficiency and SWD (18%) and ESOL (38%) Math proficiency. Small groups were not met with fidelity and rigor was lost in classroom lessons.

##### **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.

---

ELA proficiency was 35% compared to the State average of 57%. Small groups were not met with fidelity and rigor was lost in classroom lessons.

##### **EWS Areas of Concern**

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

---

Math and ELA proficiency are concerns, particularly in the intermediate levels. Small groups were not met with fidelity and rigor was lost in classroom lessons. Teacher will use the Big-M to support their planning in Math. This will ensure target task alignment and in addition offers tiered strategies for support tasks that support differentiated instruction. ELA will have a significant focus on literacy and

tiered support inside and outside the classroom that is focused and intentional to move kids forward. Science score was relatively flat year to year. With this reality and new teams of Teachers grades 3-5, we are going to drill down to four goals in the Science realm- 1. standards articulation 2. daily learning target and morph this into the students natural curiosity when it comes to Science 3. Understanding and using the curriculum with fidelity and personalize these to the vast array of students we have on campus 4. intentional data analysis and how this translates into instructional adjustments. We have applied to be a MAST school to incorporate stronger Math. Science, and STEM into classroom lessons.

### **Highest Priorities**

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

---

1. Targeted small group instruction to support individualized instruction.
2. Data and progress monitoring (staff and students)
3. Strengthen planning to impact instruction (clarity and rigor) to support individualized instruction, such as Big M use for Math, with fidelity.
4. Define the system and structures for school-wide management systems and incentivize students.
5. Develop hyper focus on attendance and behavior to increase student achievement.

## 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.

**ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD), English Language Learners (ELL), 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.

There were a significant amount of students with 2 or more Early Warning Systems (97). There was a correlation between student attendance and academic performance in ELA/Math. Additionally, student behaviors were shown to impact student learning.

### 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.

There were a significant amount of students with 2 or more Early Warning Systems (97). The school goal will be to decrease the amount of students with 2 or more EWS by 10%. Student attendance will increase by 10% in all grade levels, as compared to the previous year. Student office-related referrals will decrease by 20% from the previous year.

### Monitoring

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

We will track attendance by grade, and report to the staff and students the weekly leaders and student incentives will be used to increase attendance. Discipline data will be monitored bi-weekly during Student Services Meetings. All data is shared with staff weekly and monthly. Careful monitoring bi-weekly of EWS.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Aaron McWilliams and Karris Cooper

### 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:**

We will conduct weekly leader call-out and incentivize classes and grades that lead in attendance, weekly, monthly and quarterly. We will implement the "Beat the Bell System"; We will connect with families through phone and home visits to support student attendance. We will implement Bear Bash to celebrate student behavioral success. We will have student of the month-based district Commitment to Character. We will have the PBIS store for students to spend their earned dollars.

**Rationale:**

Motivation for students to attend school and incentivize students for making positive behavioral choices

**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**

Decreasing the number of absences and discipline incidents.

**Person Monitoring:**

Aaron McWilliams and Karris Cooper

**By When/Frequency:**

Monthly

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

-Weekly leader callout by administration -Beat the Bell incentive by classroom teachers -Phone calls by teachers -Home visits by School Social worker -Bear Bash by specialists -Monthly attendance incentive by School Social worker and team -Student of the Month by school guidance counselor -PBIS store by school behavior specialist

**Area of Focus #2**

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

**Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**

**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.

There was a drop in performance in both ELA and Math instruction. There was a lack of congruence between intentional staff development for targeted small group instruction with rigor and fidelity. This translated to mixed results with instructional delivery.

**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.

---

Student data will increase by 14% from 35% to 49% the previous year in ELA proficiency and 11% from 39% to 50% in Math proficiency. Student learning gains will increase by 12% from 54% to 66% in ELA gains and will increase 9% from 59% to 68% in Math gains.

3rd grade ELA will increase 16% from 37% proficient to 53% proficient.

Science proficiency will increase 8% from 38% to 46% proficient.

**Monitoring**

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

---

Data Analysis meetings, PLC and Academic Services Team Meeting, administration/academic coach walk-throughs, look-fors and trend data; MTSS walk-throughs for fidelity.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Aaron McWilliams and Karris Cooper

**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:**

Small Group Instruction in both ELA and Math, Planning sessions, Professional development (weekly); Coaching cycles, lesson rehearsals, teachers observing teachers, MTSS intervention as applicable.

**Rationale:**

Best practice shown to support student learning with a more targeted focus and support, yield a greater outcome.

**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**

Targeted planning for ELA/Math small groups

**Person Monitoring:****By When/Frequency:**



Aaron McWilliams and Karris Cooper

Weekly

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

-Training for staff on Small Group/Labs by academic coaches and administration -Weekly planning supports and lesson rehearsals periodically by academic coaches -Coaching Cycle on Small Group by academic coaches -Teachers observing teachers by academic coaches -Walk throughs for trends/look-fors by administrators and academic coaches -MTSS interventions by MTSS coaches

**Area of Focus #3**

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

**Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching****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.

---

Grades K-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA/Math Coaching:

We will focus on a culture of coaching that will support building teacher capacity and increasing efficacy. Coaches will provide professional development and strategies to increase student achievement

**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.

---

K-5th grade will increase 10% proficiency as measured by the STAR and FAST assessments.

**Monitoring**

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

---

Area of Focus will be monitored by the Academic Services Team and Administration, through walk-throughs, feedback cycles and observations, and using PM1 and PM2 data to drive instructional decisions.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Aaron McWilliams and Karris Cooper

**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:**

Coaching cycles will be used based on teacher data to provide intentional coaching.

**Rationale:**

-Provide Coaching on effective implementation of small groups -Create teacher experiences for teams to observe effective small groups -Monitor the fidelity of implementation

**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**

Literacy Coaching Professional Learning

**Person Monitoring:**

Aaron McWilliams and Karris Cooper

**By When/Frequency:**

Weekly

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

Leadership team will meet to discuss progress and effectiveness of coaching cycles.

**Area of Focus #4**

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.

Continue focusing on collaborative planning, benchmark-aligned instruction, high levels of student engagement with tasks, and intentional small-group instruction focused on foundational literacy skills.

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

Strategically focus on fully implementing the Early Literacy Strategies by focusing on VPK-2 classrooms, ensuring equitable use of resources, including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

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

---

Create a culture of collaboration by establishing demonstration/model classrooms at each grade level where ELA teachers learn from and inspire one another.

**Grades K-2: Measurable Outcome(s)**

---

Proficiency scores as measured on STAR PM3 will increase by 10% proficiency in ELA in each grade level.

**Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)**

---

Proficiency scores as measured on STAR PM3 will increase by 10% proficiency in ELA in each grade level.

**Monitoring**

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

Coaching, feedback, and mutual work on these will occur with administration, coaches, and the respective teaching Teams. Regular, intentional updates and cycles to ensure fidelity and implementation of stated goals and objectives.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Aaron McWilliams and Karris Cooper

**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:**

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

**Rationale:**

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

**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**

Literacy Coaching

**Person Monitoring:**

Anca Irimie

**By When/Frequency:**

Weekly

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

Literacy coaches work with school principals to plan and implement consistent professional learning outlined by the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative around evidence-based practices grounded in the science of reading as well as the UFLC Flamingo Small group model to demonstrate a significant effect on improving student outcomes. • Literacy coaches prioritize time to those teachers, activities, and roles that will have the greatest impact on student achievement in reading, namely coaching, modeling, and mentoring in classrooms daily. • Literacy coaches support and train teachers to administer assessments, analyze data and use data to differentiate instruction

**Action Step #2**

Professional Learning

**Person Monitoring:**

Aaron McWilliams and Karris Cooper

**By When/Frequency:**

Weekly

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

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are guided by assessment data and are ongoing, engaging, interactive, collaborative, and job-embedded and provide time for teachers to collaborate, research, conduct lesson studies, and plan instruction. • School-based teams support Literacy Initiative professional learning sessions on the science of reading and evidence-based literacy instruction, materials, and assessment supported by the University of Florida Lastinger Center. • School-based teams provide training to teachers that integrate the six components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language, comprehension, and vocabulary) into an explicit, systematic, and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies outlined in the Pinellas Early Literacy Initiative.

## 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.

---

Increase positive culture and climate utilizing a systematic approach to positive reinforcement and

recognition of student behavior and attendance.

### **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.

---

Decrease behavioral referrals by 20% and increase student attendance by 10% as compared to the 2024-2025 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.

---

Attendance will be monitored with the CST on a bi-weekly basis. Referral rates and office call log data will be utilized to monitor student behavior and response.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Aaron McWilliams and Karris Cooper

### **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:**

PBIS schoolwide program utilizing Guidelines for Success, research based behavioral interventions (including restorative practices).

#### **Rationale:**

PBIS is a researched based program that encompasses a positive reinforcement system and appropriate classroom and school-based responses to student behavior.

#### **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**

PBIS Professional Development

#### **Person Monitoring:**

Aaron McWilliams and Karris Cooper

#### **By When/Frequency:**

bi-weekly

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

**step:**

Provide professional development in preschool with refreshers throughout the school year as needed.

## 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.

---

Pinellas Park Elementary School

<https://www.pcsb.org/Domain/60>

Pinellas Park Elementary encourages the involvement of all families in our programs and events. Parents are encouraged to become active members of our School Advisory Council (SAC) and PTA. The SAC has the responsibility for developing, implementing, and evaluating the various school level plans, including the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP). Parents will be provided opportunities to give input in the development and decision-making process of activities related to the school. Activities for accompanying children will be provided and meetings will occur at convenient hours for families. Meetings will be marketed with fliers, call-outs, the school marquee, and on social media. An annual survey will be completed by stakeholders. Results will be analyzed to evaluate the effectiveness of school programming. Parents may request additional support either directly through their children's teachers or at scheduled SAC meetings.

Information regarding school activities and input opportunities are sent home in multiple languages via fliers, school communication platforms (FOCUS, website, social media). Bilingual translation is available during school events. Teams meetings will also be offered where feasible. Missed meeting information will be posted on the website and sent home by request. Hard copies are also available in the main office.

### **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)).

---

We will have monthly in-person parent/family meetings where we will participate in activities and share learning opportunities. This will include Mom's Making Moments and All-Pro Dads. Additionally, we will have significant community presence at the Great American Teach-In in November.

<https://www.pcsb.org/pp-es>

### **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)).

---

The Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) model aligns resources in schools for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs. The MTSS model addresses both academic and behavioral needs of students through instruction and interventions developed for specific students and student groups. The Problem Solving/Response to Intervention (PS/RtI) component of MTSS is required in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA 2004).

In an effective Multi-Tiered System of Supports: learning is accelerated to close gaps and prevent new ones; fewer students are at risk over time; decisions about who needs additional support can be made rapidly; rates of intervention success are high; and goals are defined in terms of improved achievement.

The school-based MTSS Coach is used to support the framework by facilitating or modeling the components of MTSS: provide opportunities to practice problem-solving skills; provide collaborative/performance feedback to staff; develop coaching activities based on PD feedback; implementation fidelity; and student outcomes.

### **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 is developed in collaboration with stakeholders and aligned with other federal, state, and local services. At Pinellas Park Elementary, we coordinate with:

- **Federal Programs:** Title I funds support full-day programming for PreK-3 students, an MTSS Coach, and additional intervention support staff.
- **Student Services and Mental Health Programs:** We partner with the district's student services team, school counselors, and community mental health agencies to address student well-being.
- **Violence Prevention and PBIS:** Our Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) systems are aligned with schoolwide expectations and supported by restorative practices.
- **Nutrition Programs:** We coordinate with the district's Food and Nutrition Department to ensure all students receive breakfast and lunch at no cost.
- **Career Readiness and College Awareness:** Our community outreach prepare students early for college and career readiness.

## **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)).

---

We will ensure that our safety processes our tight when it comes to monitoring student wellness and mental health through regular meetings and interventions by the safety team and counseling and social services to ensure maximum impact for these students. Mentor recruitment through the community, vetted and appropriately matched to kids, will afford opportunities for genuine relationships and improved mental health.

#### **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)).

---

Using AVID strategies and real life opportunities to train students early how to transition to the university and real world job applications. Opportunities to visit and listen to college students and faculty members.

#### **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)).

---

Tiered coordination (1,2,3) for visits to classroom via walkie to gauge and quickly remedy behaviors as they occur in real time, based on the severity of the behavior by Tier and thus the appropriate personnel to address and monitor. Using our MTSS process and people with fidelity, and coupling this with Teacher classroom unity on the individualized plan.

#### **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)).

---

Intentional breakouts during pre-planning in August to address academic challenges; DWT; Climate Pinellas conference attendance and implementations; BSI Conference and implementations; data use in pre-planning and weekly throughout the school year for intentional goal setting and addressing student deficiencies in a thoughtful manner for maximum results.

### **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)).

---

Title I funds continue to support the full day three-year-old program at select elementary schools allowing the district to provide continuity of service for a full two years in early childhood prior to entering kindergarten. This seamless, two-year programming provides a strong foundation for school readiness and future educational success. This leads to a smooth transition between preschool and kindergarten for both scholars and parents. Families are familiar with the personnel, environment, rules, and safety procedures.

## VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

---

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI 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.

---

Weekly Leadership meetings to review and flush out areas of need and aligning resources accordingly to address those individual and collective needs. Alignment of budget therein to maximize intentionality

### 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).

---

Marking and using funds dictated by district and state expectations. Use of Title I funds according to district and state deadlines and expectations. Budget markers by October 30 for marked funds; alignment and use of funds at markers according to district calendar and expectations.

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply. | No |
|--|----|

| BUDGET            | ACTIVITY | FUNCTION/<br>OBJECT | FUNDING<br>SOURCE | FTE | AMOUNT |
|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|-----|--------|
| Plan Budget Total |          |                     |                   |     | 0.00   |