

Pinellas County Schools

SANDY LANE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



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)..... 28

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 33

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 34

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

Promote scholars to dream, believe, and achieve their personal, academic, and social-emotional goals through the arts.

Provide the school's vision statement

100% Student Success

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

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

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Kelly Austin

austink@pcsb.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee implementation of the SIP

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Danny Boulieris

boulierisd@pcsb.org

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist with overseeing the SIP.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Pamela Richardson

richardsonp@pcsb.org

Position Title

Magnet Coordinator and ISD

Job Duties and Responsibilities

*coordinate magnet program

*instructional staff developer - Arts Integration

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Christina Murphy-Santana

santanac@pcsb.org

Position Title

Math Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee the math goals in the SIP

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Celimar Rodriguez

rodriguezc@pcsb.org

Position Title

Science Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee the science portion of the SIP

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Veronica Scheibner

scheibnerv@pcsb.org

Position Title

ELA Primary Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee the ELA portion of the SIP in the primary grades

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Melissa Walls

wallsme@pcsb.org

Position Title

MTSS Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee ELA SIP for grades 3 - 5

Oversee Student Services

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.

At the end of the 24/25 school year, feedback was pulled from surveys and staff meetings, along with our SAC which includes families and community leaders regarding the development of the School Improvement Plan for the 25/26 school year. The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) will meet weekly throughout the 25/26 school year to ensure that the SIP is followed. In January of 2026 revisions will be made based on student data. Revisions will be determined with staff through a collaborative carousel activity. Recommendations will be determined and presented to the SAC committee and their input will also be considered. Once all scores are available, the ILT will meet to

finalize decisions based on the feedback from all stakeholders in alignment with student data.

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)).

All of our instructional practices, planning, and community building are grounded in our School Improvement Plan. We use a variety of assessments to monitor and track data. Using this information every quarter helps to assist us in revising the SIP throughout the school year.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 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
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	YES
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	100.0%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	N/A
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD) ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2024-25: A 2023-24: B 2022-23: C 2021-22: C 2020-21:

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	26	47	48	44	53	54				272
Absent 10% or more school days	1	18	13	11	15	13				71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	5	2				7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	5	0				6
Course failure in Math	1	7	2	12	7	5				34
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	4	3	18	10	0				35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	1	7	2	12	7	5				34
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	7	1	7	10	7				33
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	0	0	1	0	0				1

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	1	4	1	4	0	0				10

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	1	5	1	3	0	0				10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0				0

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		17	16	12	22	18				85
One or more suspensions			1	1		4				6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)				1		4				5
Course failure in Math				2						2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				4	7	9				20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				1	8	22				31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)		5	9	4						18
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)		3	2	6	2					13

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				3	8	15				26

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		5		3						8
Students retained two or more times				2						2

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†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	66	64	59	55	61	57	43	54	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	73	67	59	67	63	58	60	54	53
ELA Learning Gains	67	62	60	60	64	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	83	59	56	85	62	57			
Math Achievement*	63	69	64	51	66	62	38	61	59
Math Learning Gains	74	67	63	47	68	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67	56	51	55	58	52			
Science Achievement	67	70	58	55	69	57	38	62	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	67	63		65	61	47	64	59	

*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)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	70%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	560
Total Components for the FPPI	8
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
70%	59%	45%	54%	40%		42%

* 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	63%	No		
English Language Learners	79%	No		
Black/African American Students	64%	No		
Hispanic Students	80%	No		
White Students	78%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	69%	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	66%	73%	67%	83%	63%	74%	67%	67%					
Students With Disabilities	58%	70%	68%		53%	62%		64%					
English Language Learners	75%		83%		83%	75%							
Black/African American Students	58%	64%	59%	80%	55%	68%	65%	63%					
Hispanic Students	78%	80%	86%		72%	82%		80%					
White Students	83%				72%								
Economically Disadvantaged Students	65%	71%	67%	83%	62%	73%	64%	67%					

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	55%	67%	60%	85%	51%	47%	55%	55%					
Students With Disabilities	43%		43%		45%	38%							
English Language Learners	42%				67%								
Black/African American Students	46%	63%	59%	91%	37%	45%	53%	36%					
Hispanic Students	50%	57%	62%		69%	69%							
White Students	83%				67%								
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%	66%	64%	84%	52%	48%	58%	54%					

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	43%	60%			38%			38%					47%
Students With Disabilities	26%	40%			26%			10%					
English Language Learners													47%
Black/African American Students	39%	58%			32%			31%					
Hispanic Students	35%				35%								47%
White Students	67%				60%								
Economically Disadvantaged Students	44%	59%			37%			37%					42%

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	62%	65%	-3%	57%	5%
ELA	4	59%	62%	-3%	56%	3%
ELA	5	60%	61%	-1%	56%	4%
Math	3	49%	68%	-19%	63%	-14%
Math	4	75%	68%	7%	62%	13%
Math	5	59%	65%	-6%	57%	2%
Science	5	64%	67%	-3%	55%	9%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Most Improvement

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

Our biggest improvement was shown in our Math Learning Gains, increasing 28 points, from 47% at end of year 23/24 to 75% at end of year 24/25. The actions we took that attributed to this data include:

1. Collaborative Planning with a discussion about the ALD's after common assessments
2. Intentional spiral review based on data, leading to differentiated instruction during spiral review using the ALD's
3. Fluency Focus
4. Problem solving routine
5. Common math language across the school

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 lowest performance across the school was our 2nd grade cohort in reading. While all grade levels were at 58% or higher number of students proficient, 2nd grade had 49% proficient at the end of the 24/25 school year. We attribute some of this to 2 out of the 3 teachers being new teachers to teaching and the curriculum. In addition, the core curriculum needs to be adjusted with more clarity at the district level.

Greatest Decline

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

Our greatest decline across the school was our 2nd grade cohort. In reading, they only had 34% of students making learning gains from the prior year and in math, 0% of the L25 made learning gains. The contributing factors may be that 2 of the 3 teachers on the team were very new and did not understand the depth of the learning targets for the grade level. In addition, they struggled with differentiation that supported acceleration of on/above grade level students.

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.

In all categories, we scored above the state average, except for 3rd grade Math. For 3rd grade Math, the state scored at 63%, while we scored at 49%, a 14 point gap. Upon reviewing the cohort's data from the previous two years, we found that they are consistently under-performing in math than as compared to reading. One positive in the data showed that 70% of the students in the cohort did make a learning gain when compared to prior year PM3 data.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

1. Students missing 10% or more of school days is at 26% (71 students).
2. 33 students are substantially deficient in reading.

Highest Priorities

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

1. Integrating writing across all content areas
2. Cognitive engagement across all content areas, all grade levels
by building background/prior knowledge to connect to new content
3. Interactive journals in all content/grade levels
4. Teacher clarity
5. Instructional support at 2nd gr

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 Benchmark-aligned instruction

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.

In all content areas, we will continue focusing on increasing content knowledge across the sciences and social studies benchmarks through a thematic approach. In 25/26, we will add on to this intentionality through **writing across all content areas**. In our research, during 24/25, we found that our intentional focus of background knowledge around a topic was critical for our scholars to comprehend new information, thus showing large gains in ELA. Now that we are being intentional with our thematic approach across content areas, our new focus will be writing across all content areas. Research shows this is the highest cognitive complexity we ask of our scholars and to continue our trajectory of growth across all content areas, explicit and systemic instruction is needed.

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.

Proficiency in overall reading will increase from 66% to 76% as measured by PM3 data.

Proficiency in Grade 3 ELA will increase from 73% to 83% as measured by PM3 data.

Proficiency in math will increase from 63% to 73% as measured by PM3 data.

Proficiency in science will increase from 67% to 77% as measured by PM3 data.

Monitoring

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

Monitoring will occur by admin/coaches participating in collaborative planning with grade level teams. Walkthroughs in classrooms will help monitor that the instruction is being implemented as planned. Student artifacts/data will be used to monitor student mastery of the content and spiral reviewed throughout the

year as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Danny Boulieris

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 understanding of the Florida's BEST ELA, Math, and Science standards and benchmarks as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes. *Teacher Clarity *Cognitive Engagement with Content *Writing to Learn

Rationale:

Teacher clarity assures daily learning targets are explicit with evidence of student outcome to match the integrity of the benchmark. In order for teachers to ensure clarity, they must know the full the depth of the benchmark so feedback to students is effective, in order for complexity to increase. Cognitive engagement with content requires students to engage at a higher level with the content. It requires students to use prior/background knowledge and connect it to knew content in order to synthesize information beyond "right there" thinking. Writing to learn allows students to deepen their understanding of learning by reflecting and reasoning through oral and written language, thus taking it to long-term memory.

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

Yearlong professional development on Writing to Learn.

Person Monitoring:

Danny Boulieris

By When/Frequency:

Bi-weekly

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

We will incorporate writing to learn in all PD experiences across the school year, so teachers see the benefits of writing to learn in their own learning. The Writing Revolution 2.0 and Productive Struggle will be our two book studies for the school year.

Action Step #2

Writing to Learn

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:

weekly at PLC's and collaborative planning

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

TWR strategies will be rolled out in digestible chunks. The leadership team will support teachers with incorporating the strategies into their lessons at scheduled collaborative planning/PLC's.

Action Step #3

Teacher clarity

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:

daily and weekly

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

Grade level teams will use the BEST benchmarks, ALD's, and district provided gold/pink documents to backwards plan their lessons in order to provide teacher clarity throughout their instruction. Teach clarity may include gradual release model of delivery, monitoring throughout the lesson with explicit teacher feedback and support to grow all students whether it is remediation or enrichment (beyond the scope of the Level 3 ALD's)

Action Step #4

Cognitive Engagement with Content

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:

Daily and Weekly

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

Through the use of integrated topics, teachers will plan to engage students in background and/or prior knowledge needed to connect to new content, in order to build a stronger understanding of the knowledge and cognitive demands of the benchmarks. This may be pre-unit activities that build background knowledge and vocabulary building needed prior to the launch of a new social studies/science unit. This could be a review of prior learned math benchmarks that will be needed to develop new learning/connections in a math unit.

Area of Focus #2

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.

In the 24/25 school year, there was no identified achievement gap for black students in our K - 2 and 4th grade ELA data. However, there was a 30 point proficiency gap between our black and non-black sub-groups in 5th grade, and a 16 point proficiency gap in 3rd grade. In math, there was a proficiency gap between our black and non-black sub-groups in 5th grade (22% proficiency gap), 4th grade (17% gap), 3rd grade (13% gap), 2nd grade (no gap), 1st grade (16%), and Kinder (15%).

Research tells us that good readers do not always make good writers, BUT good writers always make good readers. With this in mind, we will be increasing the fluency and stamina of writing in our African American subgroup through oral rehearsal.

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.

We will increase our black proficiency in reading and math by 10 points from prior year to PM3.

Monitoring

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

We will monitor the implementation through walk-through observations and student data outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Danny Boulieris

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:

Explicitly teach the difference between everyday language and written language, then provide opportunities to build fluency and stamina in writing through oral rehearsal.

Rationale:

Many students write the way they speak, not understanding that there is a difference between oral and written etiquette in the English language. Therefore, we need to explicitly teach the difference and then provide opportunities to build fluency and stamina in writing.

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

Explicitly teach writing through oral rehearsal.

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:

weekly

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

1. Leadership will explicitly model how to write using the gradual release method, by first using oral rehearsal at the sentence level before moving to the paragraph level. 2. Teachers will explicitly model how to write using the gradual release method, by first using oral rehearsal at the sentence level before moving to the paragraph level.

Area of Focus #3

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.

While most all grade levels were at 55% or higher proficiency in ELA, our 2nd grade cohort showed a gap with only 49% being proficient as measured by the STAR Literacy PM3 assessment. This was an 18% decline in proficiency from the prior year. Due to this data being an outlier from the other grade levels, it will be focus for the 25/26 school year.

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

- o Provide instruction in broad oral language skills
- o Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies
- o Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension

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

No Answer Entered

Grades K-2: Measurable Outcome(s)

Cycle 3 2nd grade data will improve from 45% proficient to 55% proficient.

Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)

No Answer Entered

Monitoring

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

The coaches/admin will be part of the collaborative planning and the PLC's with data based problem

solving outside classroom time with our 2nd grade team. While students are in class, we will increase our walkthroughs with explicit feedback for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kelly Austin

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:

Explicit and systematic instruction will be provided along with scaffolded instruction and formative assessment and corrective feedback as the evidence-based interventions our 2nd grade teachers will be using to ensure all students are showing learning gains from Prior Year to PM3 data.

Rationale:

In order to provide corrective feedback to students, teachers have a clear understanding of the depth of the benchmarks they are teaching. The corrective feedback shows students where their misconception is OR it provides an understanding of a benchmark at a deeper level due to the extension the feedback provides. Explicit and systemic instruction (gradual release w modeling) with scaffolds as needed will be planned in advance to ensure teachers fully understand the benchmarks and the expectations they have for students. 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.

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

Explicit and systemic instruction with scaffolded instruction

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Teachers will plan with admin/coaches to ensure all lessons are explicit, systemic (gradual release) and plan built for scaffolded instruction. Teachers will implement the plan with admin/coaches provided feedback that includes both glows and a grow.

Action Step #2

Formative assessment and explicit feedback

Person Monitoring:

Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:

Daily

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

Based on the success criteria of a lesson, the teacher will use a variety of formative assessments to determine students' misconceptions or need for acceleration of the learning target. The teacher will provide explicit feedback to each student so that growth will occur no matter where the student is in their learning.

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.

PBIS is alive and well at Sandy Lane, decreasing the number of behavior support calls for the three consecutive years. However, with the loss of funding for our PBIS Rewards app this past year along with the reduction of our behavior specialist position, we believe that this school year will need some tweaks to continue our PBIS at the level we have had in prior years.

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.

We will decrease the amount of behavior support calls by 10% as measured through our Group Me App from prior year data.

Monitoring

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

We will monitor the support calls through the Group Me App, add to our spreadsheet so that we can analyze the data at our monthly behavior SBLT. This meeting will help us determine which students may need a Tier 2 or 3 plan and which staff members may need professional development support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Danny Boulieris

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 provide a well-stocked school store as a PBIS reward system. As scholars earn PBIS points, they will be calculated via Focus and can be spent in the school store.

Rationale:

Research indicates that when PBIS is implemented with fidelity, there is a reduction in behavioral incidents, an increase in academic performance, and a more positive school environment.

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

Stock school store with high interest items/experiences

Person Monitoring:

Danny Boulieris

By When/Frequency:

3 times a year

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

1. Provide an interest survey on items/experiences students are interested in earning. 2. Secure funding and purchase items based on interest surveys. 3. Design a schedule for each class to visit the school store. 4. Assign adults to run the school store by grade level.

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.

- SAC Meetings: The SIP will be disseminated and discussed at all School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. Stakeholders, including students, families, and school staff, will have the opportunity to review the plan's progress and any revisions, providing a platform for input and feedback.
Any notable progress or changes to the SIP will be shared with stakeholders during SAC meetings. This ensures transparency and allows for collaborative decision-making based on the evolving needs of our school community.
- Title I Meetings: The SIP will also be presented and discussed at Title I meetings specifically aimed at parents. These meetings will provide a deeper understanding of the plan's objectives, strategies, and outcomes, and will be conducted in a language accessible to all parents.
- Faculty Meetings: The SIP will be shared with school staff during regular faculty meetings. This ensures that all educators are well-informed about the plan's goals and strategies, promoting alignment and coordinated efforts towards its implementation.
- School Website: To enhance accessibility, the SIP will be posted on our school website. This allows all stakeholders to easily access and review the plan at their convenience. School website link:
<https://www.pcsb.org/sandylane-es>

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)).

In addition to the PFEP, located at our school website, <https://www.pcsb.org/sandylane-es>, we also have a compact we use with families at the first family event. This compact includes all the ways that the teacher, the student, and the family will work together to meet the needs of the child. All members sign the compact. The compact is revisited with the parent/child/teacher after each major cycle of testing. We hold a few family engagement events each year where we foster relationships with families by showing parents how they can work with their child academically and so we can keep communication open throughout the school year.

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)).

We conduct a gap analysis, a root cause analysis, and then complete a Comprehensive Action Plan. The following priority strategies were identified from this work:

In regards to data analysis and planning: 1. Calendar out the data analysis topics on a monthly basis based on when new data will arrive. For example, the previous month's behavior data could be the focus for the first ILT/PLC each month. The pacing calendar would be utilized to determine subject area PLC data review. 1. Continue weekly ILT and PLC meetings with a planned agenda that reviews the previous week's action step results. 2. Calendar out the action step deadlines and monitor the effectiveness with each teacher at PLC. 3. Increase the analyzing of formative assessments at PLC to include student work, rather than waiting for end of unit assessments. 4. After unit assessments, continue to use the data to spiral review rather than waiting for the end of year assessment and "cramming" a few weeks before. 5. One big area of growth that we will work on his knowledge building in content areas. We have done research and the research shows that much of the achievement gap occurs because students who come from low SES background lack opportunities to learn about science/social studies topics. We will be working on building background of our themes in ELA prior to asking students to apply the knowledge they are learning. 6. In mathematics, we are building differentiated assignments for students within spiral review so that we are meeting the needs of all kinds of learners, from striving to enrichment. It is also critical to be sure we are maintaining the integrity of the benchmarks when developing the differentiated assignments.

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)).

We coordinate with federal programs and community partners to ensure that wraparound services are leveraged to support families and students. We have increased the number of lunch pal mentors for our scholars. We have partnered with Holy Trinity Church who have members who come to read with our scholars and provide school supplies and backpacks for scholars to have at home to do academics. We partnered with Clearwater PD for bicycle safety. We have a Suncoast mental health specialist who provides counseling to several scholars across the week through the parents' health insurance. A family navigator is in place part time to support families with jobs, food, housing, and attendance of their scholars.

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)).

In order to improve students' skills outside academic areas, we have a FT school psychologist, we purchased additional days to have a FT school social worker, and we fund a small portion of our MTSS coach for student services with Title One dollars. This team of professionals uses data from behavior, early warning systems, attendance, and subject area data to determine needs of our students. They work with identified students through small group or individual counseling and/or social skills groups. In addition, we have partnered with Suncoast Mental Health and PEMHS to support students who are found to have a deeper need and families who are struggling financially with finding housing, food, transportation, etc.

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)).

N/A

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)).

We have a solid PBIS plan we use at the school. Each year during preschool, we provide PD for our teachers on a proactive approach to handle potential behavior issues in the classroom. We collect data on behavior support calls and move students through the MTSS process as needed. We work with our students on understanding where they are academically in school and help them set goals. From there, we work to support them on their action steps to achieve their goals. If a teacher is showing that he/she is struggling, the student services team and administration develops an action plan to support the teacher to success.

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.

The Title I Support Assistant is responsible for assisting in the organizing and implementing of academic and behavior support programs (PBIS, MTSS) at the school. Some of the ways this is achieved: assists teachers with data analysis, supports with documentation relative to the problem-solving process; assist teachers with involving scholars, parents, and families at all levels of the MTSS process; and participates in monthly training to remain current on techniques and services related to enrichment, intervention, and prevention.

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)).

As new data comes in, we are constantly talking with teachers and discussing the strengths and areas of growth in the data. We develop action plans to remediate or enrich based on the data and then follow-up to see the outcome of the action plans. If we see trends across a grade level and/or school, we will research and provide PD in the area of need and then practice and coach the new work in our classrooms side-by-side with teachers. From there, we continue to look at student data to determine if our work is achieving the desired 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)).

N/A

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.

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

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

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.

No

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