

Pinellas County Schools

Richard L. Sanders School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	33
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	33
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	35

Richard L. Sanders School

5025 76TH AVE N, Pinellas Park, FL 33781

<http://it.pinellas.k12.fl.us/schools/sanders>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), 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 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); 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, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), 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; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Richard L. Sanders' mission is for all students to master the academic, behavioral, and affective skills necessary for scholastic, professional and personal growth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success - Equity with Excellence for All

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
D'Ambrosio, Heidi	Principal	<p>Recruits, develops, supports, supervises, evaluates and retains an effective and diverse faculty of instructional and support staff with a focus on increased effectiveness and student achievement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Models the leadership and follow-through necessary to build collaborative school-based teams which ensure curriculum and instruction initiatives are student- focused, researched-based, and aligned with statutes, policies, standards and improvement plans. • Establishes and maintains a culture of high-expectations, equity and continuous improvement through sound judgement and consistent development, support and accountability for themselves and their team. • Maintains high visibility within the school and in the community and works to build high levels of stakeholder engagement across all aspects of the school activities. • Develops, implements, and monitors strategies and actions to make demonstrated progress toward goals within the School Improvement Plan, in alignment to the District Strategic Plan. • Demonstrates that student learning is a top priority through leadership actions focused on student achievement and success.
Brown, Kim	Assistant Principal	<p>Serves as a member of the school-based leadership team and supports the development and implementation of strategies and actions to make demonstrated progress toward goals within the School Improvement Plan, in alignment to the District Strategic Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Models the leadership and follow-through necessary to build collaborative school-based teams which ensure curriculum and instruction initiatives are student- focused, researched-based and aligned with statutes, policies, standards and improvement plans. • Supports the schoolwide culture of high-expectations, equity and continuous improvement through sound judgement and consistent development, support and accountability for themselves and their assigned teams. • Actively involved and highly visible within the school and in the community and supports stakeholder engagement across assigned school activities. • Promotes that student learning is a top priority through leadership actions focused on student achievement and success. • Supports and monitors the school learning environment which improves learning for a diverse student population. • Creates a positive school culture and learning environment through the

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>implementation of equity, restorative practices, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), and culturally relevant teaching, to ensure academic opportunity through equity and excellence for every student.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for the disciplinary procedures for assigned students, in alignment with the Student Code of Conduct.
Dubois, MaryBeth	Attendance/ Social Work	<p>This position provides a specialized service for helping students in an adjustment which enhances learning and participation in school. The students referred to this position are primarily those identified as having problems in behavior, personality, achievement and/or attendance, to the extent that they are not making constructive use of school. Responsibilities include helping students through casework, group work or consultation, either on a long or short-term basis, involving contacts with the child and/or parent, school personnel and community resource.</p>
Gaynier, Gregory	Teacher, ESE	<p>Responsible for the educational leadership of students placed in exceptional education programs, including gifted students and students with disabilities. This position encompasses the three standards included in Teacher Professional Expectations in School Board Policy, which are high student achievement, safe learning environment, and effective and efficient operations.</p>
Lowry, Dana	Behavior Specialist	<p>Establishes principles of behavior change procedures with basic understanding of applied behavior analysis. Conducts and facilitates Functional Behavior Assessments and implements Positive Behavior Intervention Plans. Establishes specific behavior management programs for students as needed. Consults with school personnel, parents, and others regarding behavior strategies. Functions in the areas of behavior management and crisis intervention and is responsible to the school principal.</p>
Bradley, Frederick	Behavior Specialist	<p>Establishes principles of behavior change procedures with basic understanding of applied behavior analysis. Conducts and facilitates Functional Behavior Assessments and implements Positive Behavior Intervention Plans. Establishes specific behavior management programs for students as needed. Consults with school personnel, parents, and others regarding behavior strategies. Functions in the areas of behavior management and crisis intervention and is responsible to the school principal.</p>
McClory, Sara	Teacher, ESE	<p>Responsible for the educational leadership of students placed in exceptional education programs, including gifted students and students with disabilities. This position encompasses the three standards included in Teacher Professional Expectations in School Board Policy, which are high</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		student achievement, safe learning environment, and effective and efficient operations.
Conner, Lacie	Teacher, ESE	Responsible for the educational leadership of students placed in exceptional education programs, including gifted students and students with disabilities. This position encompasses the three standards included in Teacher Professional Expectations in School Board Policy, which are high student achievement, safe learning environment, and effective and efficient operations.
Rigney, Kam	Teacher, ESE	Responsible for the educational leadership of students placed in exceptional education programs, including gifted students and students with disabilities. This position encompasses the three standards included in Teacher Professional Expectations in School Board Policy, which are high student achievement, safe learning environment, and effective and efficient operations. The duties include ensuring compliance with State and Federal regulations, writing and supporting the IEP process, scheduling and holding IEP meetings with various stakeholders.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

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

Our SAC is used to fulfill these requirements.

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's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored quarterly to ensure grade, attendance, and discipline data can all be reviewed and updates made as needed.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes

2022-23 Minority Rate	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2020-21: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: UNSATISFACTORY
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	1	0	1	1	3	1	4	4	6	21	
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	6	4	1	5	8	27	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	2	2	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	3	0	4	2	4	14	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	2	7	19	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	5	6	21	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	1	1	4	3	0	0	0	10	

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	0	1	1	5	3	6	4	8	29

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

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially 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 days	0	0	0	3	0	2	3	8	5	33	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	1	4	2	7	3	33	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	7	4	27	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	3	3	20	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	19	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	18	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	6	

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	0	0	0	4	1	4	4	8	7	42

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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 days	0	0	0	3	0	2	3	8	5	21	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	1	4	2	7	3	21	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	7	4	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	3	3	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	9	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	9	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	6	

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	0	0	0	4	1	4	4	8	7	28

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that 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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	15			10			17		
ELA Learning Gains	31			31			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	6			12			17		
Math Learning Gains	32			24			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	0			13			20		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement*				25					
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate	18								
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* 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.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	17
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	102
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	18

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 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%
SWD	17	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				

2021-22 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%
BLK	13	Yes	3	2
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	20	Yes	2	2
FRL	15	Yes	3	3

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. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	15	31		6	32		0			18		
SWD	15	31		6	32		0			18		
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18			8								
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	11	28		5	35							
FRL	13	32		3	29		0					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	10	31		12	24		13	25				
SWD	10	31		12	24		13	25				
ELL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	11	33		19	28							
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	11	29		6	15		10					
FRL	6	31		9	21		17	17				

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	17	48		17	38		20					
SWD	17	48		17	38		20					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19	47		17	26							
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	17			20								
FRL	17	52		13	38							

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Our greatest need of improvement is in math gains. Our area that we would consider the most problematic is foundational math skills. Many of our students lack the foundation in math. They struggle with basic addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. Fast PM1, PM2, and PM3 help support this conclusion, as well as EOC scores. We had a total of 11 students take either Algebra I or Geometry EOC and 10 of those students scored a level 1. When breaking down data from Fast PM3 the vast majority of our students were below grade level standards in all areas. This is across elementary, middle, and high school.

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

Although data for the 2022-2023 school year show a school-wide learning gain increase, proficiency in ELA and Math are a top priority as 100% of our students are below grade level in math and 81% of our students are below grade level in ELA. Standardized tests show that 58% of our students showed growth in ELA and 44% showed growth in Math. School wide ELA data saw a 32% increase, from the 2021-22 school year, in learning gains and math data saw a 15% increase in learning gains from the 2021-22 school year.

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.

Our data component that had the greatest gap when compared with the state average was in math. Zero percent of our students showed proficiency and less than 20% showed growth. The factors that contributed to this was, we started the school year off without a teacher in our middle school math class. There were countless substitute teachers in the class until the second quarter of school. Once a teacher was hired, she was a first-year teacher who was out of field.

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

Our ELA data showed them most improvement. For the 2021/22 school year our learning gains in ELA was 26%, this school year our learning gains jumped to 58% percent. That is a 32% increase. This jump can be attributed to many things, one being dedicated and consistent ELA teachers. We also incorporated Reading Wednesdays into our weekly schedule. Additionally, for semester one we assigned a reading resource teacher to pull groups of students to hold reading interventions with on a daily.

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

Our two main areas of concern with the EWS are attendance and the proficiency of our students.

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

1. Biweekly collaborative planning to improve student learning by delivering research-based, collaborative, student-centered instruction, promoting active participation, discussion, and listening.
2. Regularly analyze formal and informal assessment data (i.e., preconceptions, misconceptions, diagnostic, etc.) to inform groupings and modify instruction based on student needs.
3. Monitoring for evidence of standards-based instruction (i.e., walkthroughs and data chats) and school-

specific improvement goals as a means of providing meaningful feedback and determining future actions.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to spring (2019) School Profiles, students identified as Black/African American made up 43.8% (28 of 64 students) of our total population, with 27% scoring proficient on Florida Standardized Assessments (FSA). In order to prepare students for college, career, life, and to close the achievement gap, we need to increase the proficiency of African American students. In addition, School Profiles data for the same time frame showed 46.9% (30 of 64 students) of our student population identified with the White subgroup, with 17% of these being proficient in ELA and Mathematics. Additionally, School Profiles, showed 79.9% of our student population belonged to the economically disadvantaged subgroup, with 30% of these students scoring proficient in FSA. Furthermore, 100% of our students belong to the Students with Disabilities subgroup, with 28% scoring proficient on state-wide assessments. All subgroups were reclassified into a single group because all our students are Students with Disabilities and Economically Disadvantaged.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The proficiency of students in our Black/African American subgroup will increase from 27% to 55% (2022-2023) as measured by FAST, NGSSS, and EOCs and the (2022-2023) Federal Percent of Points Index report. The proficiency of students in the White subgroup will increase from 17% (2018-19) to at least 55% (2022-2023) as measured by FAST, NGSSS, and EOCs. The percentage of all students in our Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup achieving proficiency will increase from 30% (2018-19) to at least 55% (2021-2022)

as measured by FSA/FSAA ELA data. The percentage of all students in our Students with Disabilities Subgroup scoring proficient will increase from 28% (2018-2019) to at least 55% (2021-2022) as measured by FSA/ FSAA data.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor progress toward the desired outcome by reviewing and analyzing PM (Progress Monitoring) and Cycle Assessments. We will also meet monthly with the reading intervention teacher to review skill and strategy development of students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Implement effective academic, behavioral, and social emotional interventions based on the close monitoring of student data and IEP's to ensure that each student's individual needs are known and met.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By focusing our SIP efforts on providing individualized academic, social emotional, and behavior supports we will increase student achievement and graduation rates

while decreasing incidents of behavior thereby increasing student engagement and achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide accessibility to real-time individualized data for each subgroup to implement monthly effective discussions (i.e., teacher to student check ins, collaborate PLC meetings, etc.) and improve overall academic achievement.

Person Responsible: Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

Regularly analyze achievement gains, and student discipline data to inform and/or modify instruction based on the needs of the identified subgroup.

Person Responsible: Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

Ensure access to professional development focusing on equity and excellence as well as monitoring of learning practices in all classrooms.

Person Responsible: Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

Provide targeted support to cultivate a growth mindset in students and increase academic success through school-wide intervention strategies (i.e., goal setting, restorative practices, and SEL centered approaches).

Person Responsible: Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

#2. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Graduation rate varies from year to year at our facility and during the (2022-2023) we had three graduates, one on time, one a year early, and one over age senior. (2018-2019) school year, we had two seniors, (one graduating on time with his zoned high school, and the other student graduating with Access Points but was not an on-time graduate). At the end of the (2020-2021) school year we had seven graduates, five deferring diplomas to enter extended transition, one early graduate and one on-time graduate. Contributors to these students' gaps in achievement include frequent changes in residence/ placements of students/families, mental health challenges, academic deficits, and low motivation associated with a history of prior negative school experiences. If we intensify our staff and student focus on individual student data, we will be able increase our graduation rate by providing continuous academic, behavior, and attendance supports more closely aligned with data-based assessments of student needs. At the end of (2019-2020) we did not have any seniors, as our only potential graduate transferred to another district.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

For the 2023-2024 school year, we currently have 4 seniors, our goal is to ensure that they each complete all course requirements for graduation by May 2024.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring toward this desired outcome will be achieved by reviewing course completion and GPA requirements quarterly with each student.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Strengthen staff communication, engagement and planning with students and families when students are not on-track to graduate. Intensify graduation committee focus on monitoring data and interventions aimed at ensuring on-track promotion throughout high school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Intensifying staff and student focus on individualized data, will provide continuous academic, behavior, and attendance supports more closely aligned with data-based assessments of student needs aimed at improving our graduation rate.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Monitor student academic performance, course enrollment and access to graduation requirements and vocational/college preparatory programs.

Person Responsible: Kam Rigney (rigneyk@pcsb.org)

Annually review of each student's IEP to ensure all stakeholders understand the student's progress toward graduation and vocational/college preparatory program options.

Person Responsible: Kam Rigney (rigneyk@pcsb.org)

Provide referrals to Vocational Rehabilitation for career assessment and facilitate student discussions to ensure understanding of post-graduation goals.

Person Responsible: Kam Rigney (rigneyk@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Although learning gains are not available for the 2022-2023 school year, standardized math assessment data for (2021-2022) shows 29% of our students achieved learning gains (a 7% increase over the prior year).

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our school goal is to increase the percent of all students achieving learning gains (as measured by FAST and EOCs) in Math from 29% (2021-2022) to at least 65% by May 2024.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress toward math proficiency will be documented and analyzed using IXL, common formative assessments, Cycle Assessment, and FAST data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Strengthen staff knowledge regarding ways to effectively organize students to interact with content, engage in rigorous student-centered Instruction, and work toward closing the achievement gap for all subgroups (via professional development and PLCs). Student achievement will be monitored through benchmark assessments, data chats, which will be discussed, reflected upon, and improved at all levels (e.g., individuals, small groups, school leadership, and district stakeholders).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By focusing our school improvement efforts on increasing student engagement in rigorous standards-based instruction and efficiently applying data-driven individualized supports/ resources for struggling students, we will increase student learning gains to at least 65%, thus making progress toward closing the achievement gap in all identified subgroups. Marzano research indicates these elements are key to quality instruction thereby improving student outcomes. Data chats are imperative for teachers to analyze student progress and identify areas in need of support. Finally, Instructional Support Model (ISM) data shows that classroom practices do not consistently include student-centered learning environments with rigor, differentiation practices, or higher order thinking routines.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Improve student learning by delivering research-based, collaborative, student-centered instruction, promoting active participation, discussion, and listening.

Person Responsible: Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

Conduct regular, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of data chats to review student data to identify and plan for differentiation opportunities based on the student readiness, interest, and/or learning profile. Data can come from the FAST assessments, IXL, Instructional Materials assessments, and/or teacher and district formal and informal assessments.

Person Responsible: Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize IXL to have students practice on a benchmark aligned to their skill to achieve proficiency or mastery. Students will also use their Personalized Action Plan from the Diagnostic Snapshot to address mathematical skills gaps with an emphasis on utilizing the program outside of the school day to extend beyond the classroom.

Person Responsible: Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

Administrative monitoring for evidence of standards-based instruction (i.e., walkthroughs and data chats) and school-specific improvement goals as a means of providing meaningful feedback and determining future actions.

Person Responsible: Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

Celebrating student success by implementing monthly goal setting, facilitating student-led conferences to share progress with family members or guardians, and encouraging the use of high-yield strategies to ensure continuous growth.

Person Responsible: Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Although, learning gain data is not available for the 2022-2023 school year, the data for the (2021-2022) school year shows school-wide learning gains increased (26% to 27.5%). A majority of our students are scoring below proficiency when compared to their district-wide peers. School-wide, ELA data from the (2021-2022) school year points to a 5% decrease in learning gains (down to 26%), as well the fact 31% of our total students achieved learning gains in ELA, which was down 14%, when compared to (2019-2020).

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our school goal is to increase the percent of all students achieving learning gains (as measured by FAST, NGSSS, and EOCs) in ELA from 26% (2021-2022) to 65% by May 2023; Math from 29% (2021-2022) to at least 65% by May 2023;

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor progress in ELA toward the desired outcome by reviewing and analyzing Cycle Assessments. We will also meet monthly with the Reading Intervention Teacher to review the development of students' skills and use of literacy strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Strengthen staff knowledge regarding ways to effectively organize students to interact with content, engage in rigorous student-centered Instruction, and work toward closing the achievement gap for all subgroups (via professional development and PLCs). Student achievement will be monitored through benchmark assessments, data chats, which will be discussed, reflected upon, and improved at all levels (e.g., individuals, small groups, school leadership, and district stakeholders).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By focusing our school improvement efforts on increasing student engagement in rigorous standards-based instruction and efficiently applying data-driven individualized supports/ resources for struggling students, we will increase student learning gains to at least 65%, thus making progress toward closing the achievement gap in all identified subgroups. Marzano research indicates these elements are key to quality instruction thereby improving student outcomes. Data chats are imperative for teachers to analyze student progress and identify areas in need of support. Finally, Instructional Support Model (ISM) data shows that classroom practices do not consistently include student-centered learning environments with rigor, differentiation practices, or higher order thinking routines.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Plan for active learning opportunities to increase joy and satisfaction in learning for each student, including but not limited to project based learning.

Person Responsible: Lacie Conner (connerl@pcsb.org)

Regularly analyze formal and informal assessment data (i.e., preconceptions, misconceptions, diagnostic, etc.,) to inform groupings and modify instruction based on student needs.

Person Responsible: Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

Ensure consistent and equitable application of instructional support for direct instruction (district supplied resources) and independent learning (i.e., iReady, iStation, IXL), using state and district resources (such as BEST ELA Standards and PCS Gold Document) to synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

Person Responsible: Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

Provide structures for planning/PLCs where teachers and administrators regularly engage in data/student work analysis as well as intellectual prep and lesson rehearsal including planning for scaffolds that address gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible: Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to: positive expectations for success, novel tasks or other approaches to stimulate curiosity; developing a compelling introduction for each lesson: a one or two minute preview or "pitch" to help students see the relevance of the day's lesson; meaningful tasks related to student interests and cultural backgrounds; thought provoking challenges or dilemmas; employ simple procedures (such as proximity) for ensuring that every student is attentive during instruction-- with their eyes are on the teacher, ready to learn.

Person Responsible: Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

Increase student learning and engagement through experiential opportunities on field trips aligned to academics.

Person Responsible: Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We will continue the use of PBIS and our house-based system to increase the positive culture school wide. We will also continue the roll out of Conscious Discipline. Currently we are in year two of a three year roll out.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

For the 2022-23 school year our level of performance according to school-wide behavior details the following: 77 In School Suspensions and 147 Out of School Suspensions. For the 2021-22 school year, 68 In School Suspensions and 122 Out of School Suspensions. We saw an increase of in school suspensions and out of school suspensions. This upcoming school year we expect to see a decrease of at least 10%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This will be monitored on a quarterly basis. Each quarter the PBIS team will meet and pull in school and out of school suspension data. We will compare where we are for that quarter in comparison to where we were during that timeframe from the previous school year. Quarterly adjustments will be made as needed to ensure our goal is reached.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Frederick Bradley (bradleyf@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented is PBIS and Conscious Discipline. We will complete and utilize tools provided by the district and state to monitor and improve implementation of Positive Behavior Supports school wide. This includes FLPBIS, Tier 1 PBIS walkthrough with restorative practice components, benchmark of quality, tiered fidelity inventory, and self-assessment with multi-tiered systems of support. We will also continue to use all resources aligned to Conscious Discipline via their book, web site, and trainer we acquired to train our staff as we navigate our three year roll out.

Additionally, the district is piloting Jack Berckmeyer's teaming approach. According to Berckmeyer, effective teaming gives kids a safe, positive, and productive learning environment. It contributes to higher levels of achievement, elevates the sense of school connectedness and belonging, strengthens student's social skills, nourishes greater connection/involvement with families, and gives teachers a sense of support and camaraderie.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were selected as they have proven to be effective in many schools. PBIS is a system that has been adopted by the district and is used in many schools. Data has shown that when implemented correctly, it will be effective. Conscious Discipline also has proven to be effective.

Also, when reflecting on the nature of our school, our students need a great deal of positive reinforcement and relationship building. Both of these interventions have a heavy focus on positive reinforcement and relationship building.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Training developed for preschool to ensure that all teachers are fluent in PBIS, the school's Guidelines for Success, are aware of monthly/quarterly school wide events, and run their class as a PBIS class.

Person Responsible: Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

A Conscious Discipline book study course will be set up to allow new staff to catch up on what they missed the prior school year and will serve as a refresher for returning staff. This will align with the Conscious Discipline professional development that will be offered during preschool and throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Person Responsible: Sara McClory (mcclorys@pcsb.org)

Prior to the first day of school with students, the PBIS coordinator will use the Tier 1 walkthrough tool to ensure signage reflecting revised 'Guidelines for Success' (expectations) are posted in common areas and to evaluate evidence of classroom PBIS systems alignment to schoolwide practices. Subsequent walkthroughs will be conducted at least quarterly and followed up upon to correct any missing or misaligned pieces and to monitor consistency in application.

Person Responsible: Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

Ensure every student has a meaningful connection to at least one trusted adult in school that is not dependent on academic performance.

Person Responsible: Frederick Bradley (bradleyf@pcsb.org)

Use Jack Berckemeyer's teaming approach to create consistent and predictable environments where expectations are explicit so that the whole school community knows how to be successful, via offering trainings and follow up meetings with staff to build a solid team-teaching approach amongst the entire school.

Person Responsible: Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The majority of our instructional staff have five years or less teaching experience. Professional learning in a variety of ways is crucial to building their success and outcomes for our students. Deepen understanding of standards and benchmarks for ELA, Reading, Science, Social Studies and Math as a nonnegotiable for improving student outcomes. Additionally, school faculty will need professional development in PBIS and school climate / equity. These areas will help staff work and support the needs of all learners.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students will increase in their proficiency within their content areas by 10% as a direct result of content being taught the required standards and at the correct level of rigor the standard calls for.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Common Planning and Professional Learning Community logs will be utilized to monitor teacher planning. Walk through feedback and observations will be monitored. Student data will be tracked through formative / summative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

As teachers become skilled in the strategy, they will see changes in the students' abilities to process and understand concepts and identify critical concepts. Use of common planning with administrator and intervention specialist (as available) will occur weekly.

Administrators and lead teachers/behavior specialists/social workers will also attend professional development conferences so they can then teach our staff in strategies that will help increase student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing teachers with professional development, instructional strategies and classroom management within their content area / small group will provide the ability of the behavior specialist/district coaches/ and /or administrator to use the coaching cycle to increase teacher knowledge. By training our behavioral specialists and administrators we can help our staff deepen their understanding of instructional practices, strategies and tools to use within their classrooms. This will include utilizing PBIS to build classroom cultures that promote engaging and meaningful environments.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide professional development on instructional practices, vertical progression and unpacking of standards for all key stakeholders.

Person Responsible: Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

Utilize state and district resources to understand the expected outcomes of their students.

Person Responsible: Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

Utilize Common planning to collaborate and plan with their colleagues.

Person Responsible: Kim Brown (brownkiml@pcsb.org)

Attend conferences in the areas of Standards, PBIS, Equity and all instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

#7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As it pertains to science achievement on state-wide assessments in 2022-2203 - We did not have students take the Biology EOC, they will this year for enrolled Biology students. 8th grade students scores on the state Science test, 3 scored a Level 1, 1 scored a Level 2, and 1 scored a Level 3. Our 5th grade students, 1 scored a Level 1, 1 scored a Level 2, and 2 scored a Level 3. 2021-2022 (grades 5, 8, and/or Biology EOC), 7% of students met ESSA proficiency (level 3 or above). We expect this proficiency to jump to 55% by May 2024.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

In 2023-2024 we expect student proficiency on the Biology EOC to go from 37.5% (2021-2022)(no 20223-2023 data is available) to 50%, by May 2024. Our 8th grade students are expected to score a Level 2 or higher on the state test and 5th graders are also expected to score a Level 2 or higher on the state test by May 2024.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress for Science will be monitored via state-administered cycle assessments and supplemented with alternative formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Strengthen staff knowledge regarding ways to effectively organize students to interact with content, engage in rigorous student-centered Instruction, and work toward closing the achievement gap for all subgroups (via professional development and PLCs). Student achievement will be monitored through benchmark assessments, data chats, which will be discussed, reflected upon, and improved at all levels (e.g., individuals, small groups, school leadership, and district stakeholders).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By focusing our school improvement efforts on increasing student engagement in rigorous standards-based instruction and efficiently applying data-driven individualized supports/ resources for struggling students, we will increase student learning gains to at least 65%, thus making progress toward closing the achievement gap in all identified subgroups. Marzano research indicates these elements are key to quality instruction thereby improving student outcomes. Data chats are imperative for teachers to analyze student progress and identify areas in need of support. Finally, Instructional Support Model (ISM) data shows that classroom practices do not consistently include student-centered learning environments with rigor, differentiation practices, or higher order thinking routines.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Improve student learning by delivering research-based, collaborative, student-centered instruction, promoting active participation, discussion, and listening.

Person Responsible: Lacie Conner (connerl@pcsb.org)

Regularly analyze formal and informal assessment data (i.e., preconceptions, misconceptions, diagnostic, etc.,) to inform groupings and modify instruction based on student needs.

Person Responsible: Lacie Conner (connerl@pcsb.org)

Administrative monitoring for evidence of standards-based instruction (i.e., walkthroughs and data chats) and school-specific improvement goals as a means of providing meaningful feedback and determining future actions.

Person Responsible: Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

Increase student learning and engagement through experiential opportunities on field trips aligned to academics.

Person Responsible: Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

#8. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Civics EOC data for the (2022-2023) school year - out of 6 students - 5 students scored a Level 1 and 1 scored a Level 2. US History EOC data for the (2022-2023) School year - out of 3 students, 2 scored Level 1 and 1 scored a Level 2. (2020-2021) school year shows one out of six total students achieved proficiency on the Civics EOC by scoring a level 5 (district average 70%, school average, 16.67%); and one student (out of four, 25%) scored a level 2 on the U.S. History EOC. Data for the (2021-2022) shows that 1 student scored a level 5; and 1 student scored a level 3 on the Civics EOC. During the (2021-2022) school year, 1 student scored a level 4, one student scored a level 3, 1 a level 2 on the U.S. History EOC.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Civics EOC - 50% of students taking the EOC will score a Level 3 or above, by May 2024; US History EOC 50% of students will score a Level 3 or higher by May 2024.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress for Civics/U.S. History will be monitored via state-administered cycle assessments and supplemented with alternative formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Strengthen staff knowledge regarding ways to effectively organize students to interact with content, engage in rigorous student-centered Instruction, and work toward closing the achievement gap for all subgroups (via professional development and PLCs). Student achievement will be monitored through cycle assessments, formative data, data chats, which will be discussed, reflected upon, and improved at all levels (e.g., individuals, small groups, school leadership, and district stakeholders).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By focusing our school improvement efforts on increasing student engagement in rigorous standards-based instruction and efficiently applying data-drive for individualized supports/ resources for struggling students, we will increase student learning gains, thus making progress toward closing the achievement gap in all identified subgroups. Marzano research indicates these elements are key to quality instruction thereby improving student outcomes. Data chats are imperative for teachers to analyze student progress and identify

areas in need of support. Finally, Instructional Support Model (ISM) data shows that classroom practices do not consistently include student-centered learning environments with rigor, differentiation practices, or higher order thinking routines.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Improve student learning by delivering research-based, collaborative, student-centered instruction, promoting active participation, discussion, and listening.

Person Responsible: Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

Regularly analyze formal and informal assessment data (i.e., preconceptions, misconceptions, diagnostic, etc.,) to inform groupings and modify instruction based on student needs.

Person Responsible: Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

Administrative monitoring for evidence of standards-based instruction (i.e., walkthroughs and data chats) and school-specific improvement goals as a means of providing meaningful feedback and determining future actions.

Person Responsible: Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

Celebrating student success by implementing monthly goal setting, facilitating student-led conferences to share progress with family members or guardians, and encouraging the use of high-yield strategies to ensure continuous growth.

Person Responsible: Dana Lowry (lowryd@pcsb.org)

Increase student learning and engagement through experiential opportunities on field trips aligned to academics.

Person Responsible: Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Considering the small number of students our school service, we typically do not get much money. However, with the limited amount of money we receive we use it to purchase student supplies that align with our areas of need. Typically, administration, the secretary and team leaders discuss our greatest area of need and what supplies we can use to help bridge the gap in that area. We also meet with our School Advisory Council to discuss needs and get input from them when spending funds. For example, this year we need to place more emphasis on math interventions. Therefore, we will use the funds to purchase math manipulatives and math games.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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 the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

We disseminate information through our school website, SAC meetings, parent meetings and workshops, and emails. We will disseminate information at the beginning of the school year and provide quarterly updates to our 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 Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We schedule parent nights, SAC meetings, and individual meetings with parents. Our Family Engagement Plan is shared at the beginning of the year during Open House and posted on our school's website.

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Learning will be accelerated via various avenues. First, the master schedule has been changed to reflect a block schedule for core classes, allowing all cores classes 90-minute class sessions. During this time rotations will happen, to ensure each student will have instruction tailored to their individual needs. Additionally, staff will be more fluent in their subject area as there will be collaborative planning done on a weekly basis. This will allow teachers to plan together and potentially team teach to pull out the strength in each teacher and in turn, each student. There will be monthly data chats to discuss trends, needs for remediation, and/or enrichment. Common formative assessments will also be given for each unit to drive instruction.

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 ESSA, 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). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Not applicable.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Our school has four social workers and one psychologist along with four behavior specialists. We have also provided our staff training in various trauma trainings over the past few years and all of our staff are required to complete the Youth Mental Health First Aid training. Our student services team (social workers and psychologist) work collaboratively to ensure the needs of each student are met and supported.

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Our VE Specialist addresses postsecondary opportunities during IEP meetings with families and students. She also works closely with our high school and extended transition teacher to ensure our students have access to these opportunities.

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. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We utilize a Level System school-wide that is incorporated into our PBIS system to prevent and address problem behavior. We continue to utilize our Restorative Practices and are also beginning our second year roll out of Conscious Discipline.

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. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Staff will be provided with professional development that revolves around team teaching, block schedule teaching, project-based learning, classroom management, Conscious Discipline, and weekly PLCs that require each team to identify a problem, barriers, action steps, and a timeline to complete the action steps. Strengthen staff knowledge regarding ways to effectively organize students to interact with content, engage in rigorous student-centered instruction, and work toward closing the achievement gap for all subgroups (via professional development and PLCs). Student achievement will be monitored through benchmark assessments, data chats, which will be discussed, reflected upon, and improved at all levels (e.g., individuals, small groups, school leadership, and district stakeholders).

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Not applicable.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$4,806.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			3231 - Richard L. Sanders School	UniSIG		\$4,806.00
			Notes: Instruction, exceptional/supplies: Flexible seating to include bean bags chairs, rocking chairs, and sensory items to support student engagement in the classroom and meet their sensory needs at the same time.			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Graduation: Graduation				\$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$234.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			3231 - Richard L. Sanders School	UniSIG		\$234.50
			<i>Notes: Instruction, exceptional/supplies: Math supplies to include items such as classroom sets of scientific calculators, math manipulatives, white boards, chart paper, dry erase markers, paper, pencils, graph paper and copies.</i>			
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$4,776.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			3231 - Richard L. Sanders School	UniSIG		\$2,400.00
			<i>Notes: Student transportation services/other purchased services: Estimated costs for Straz performances in Tampa = \$1,200 (\$600/bus x 2 buses) and for Duke Energy Center in St. Petersburg = \$1,200 (\$600/bus x 2 buses).</i>			
			3231 - Richard L. Sanders School	UniSIG		\$2,376.50
			<i>Notes: Instruction, exceptional/travel: Students will attend field trips to see plays. This student experience will help students by seeing literary works put into action. Play options are offered at both the St. Petersburg, Florida Duke Energy Center for the Arts (through Chamber Theatre) and Tampa, Florida Straz theater. The plays offered align with 8th grade content and include options such as Shakespeare. We estimate approximately 70 tickets will be needed per field trip for our 8th grade students. Estimated admission costs for Straz performances = \$840 (\$12 x 70) and for Duke Energy Center \$1,536.50 (\$21.95 x 70). Transportation costs are a separate budget line.</i>			
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$3,800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			3231 - Richard L. Sanders School	UniSIG		\$3,800.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, exceptional/supplies: To support and expand our PBIS program, the school will include kinesthetic learning. This activity includes creating an incentive area that allows students to use kinesthetic activities to reinforce learning. The kinesthetic learning style involves whole-body movement and tactile engagement. Kinesthetic learners process information best when they are physically engaged during the learning process; they often prefer learning through doing approach. Additional PBIS activities will include semester incentives such as participation in field day events. This activity includes purchasing the equipment and supplies needed to host the field day events and establish the kinesthetic learning environment.</i>			
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning				\$23,179.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			3231 - Richard L. Sanders School	UniSIG		\$11,600.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/travel: Four staff (a combination of administrators and teacher leaders) will attend the Roy Clark Association (RCA) House Conference in Atlanta, GA on July 11-12, 2024. This professional development is an interactive, immersive learning experience where attendees observe classes and participate in dynamic workshops teaching how to create and enhance the house system in a way that transforms the school environment, creates a sense of belonging for all students and families, ignites a passion for learning, provides meaningful support, encourages academic excellence and a climate and culture where all students and staff thrive. Estimated cost for each participant include registration \$1,050, meals \$192 (3 days x \$64/day), mileage/parking/ride shares \$208, airfare \$400, and lodging \$1,050 (3 nights @ \$350/night) = \$2,900 per person. Total cost for 4 attendees = \$11,600 (\$2,900 x 4 attendees).</i>			

			3231 - Richard L. Sanders School	UniSIG		\$8,579.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/travel: Principal to attend the Harvard School Turn Around Leaders Conference held in Cambridge, MA in June 2024. School turnaround efforts require highly effective leaders who are able to create the conditions for rapid and sustained change. Leaders must drive fundamental shifts in school culture and instructional practice that results in rapid gains and ongoing performance. The demands are great, and the need for such leaders is even greater. This specialized leadership program from The Principals' Center brings together individuals and teams who are charged with leading change in their schools and districts. Participants learn how to establish high expectations for instructional quality, develop effective teams, translate data into action, and generate deep engagement among school and community stakeholders. They leave with a school improvement plan they can put into action right away. Cost breakdown. Total travel costs for this five-day program for one staff are \$8,256 and include registration \$3,995, lodging \$2,677 (6 nights for 1 rooms), airfare \$873 (\$873 x 1), meals \$384 (\$64/day x 6 days x 1), and ground transportation/parking \$650.</i>			
			3231 - Richard L. Sanders School	UniSIG		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/travel: The conference: Bureau of School Improvement (BSI) serves as a partner in supporting improved outcomes for all students through strategic problem solving, capacity building, and the implementation of sustainable systems in the areas of: Transformational Leadership, Standards-based Planning, Instruction, and Learning, Positive Culture and Environment. Total cost per person = \$1,000 which includes lodging \$600 (\$200 x 3 nights), meals \$192 (\$64 x 3 days), and parking/mileage \$208. Cost for 3 staff = \$3,000.</i>			
7	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$5,036.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			3231 - Richard L. Sanders School	UniSIG		\$1,436.50
			<i>Notes: Instruction, exceptional/travel: Field Trips will be attended by our science scholars to enhance the classroom learning experience. Field Trips will be attended by each grade level. These can include trips to: Tampa Bay Watch and the Clearwater Marine Aquarium (offering programs directly tied to all grade level content areas). Estimated costs for Tampa Bay Watch = \$250 (1 program days @ \$250/day for school [70 students per day]. Estimated costs for Clearwater Aquarium = \$696.50 (1 program day [70 tickets x \$9.95 per day]). MOSI (Museum of Science and Industry \$490 (\$7 per ticket x 70). Transportation costs are a separate budget line.</i>			
			3231 - Richard L. Sanders School	UniSIG		\$3,600.00
			<i>Notes: Student transportation services/other purchased services: Estimated costs for Tampa Bay Watch \$1,200 (2 buses per program day x 1 days x \$600), Clearwater Aquarium = \$1,200 (two buses per program day x 1 days), MOSI = \$1200 (2 buses x 1 day)</i>			
8	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies				\$3,625.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			3231 - Richard L. Sanders School	UniSIG		\$2,400.00
			<i>Notes: Student transportation services/other purchased services: Estimated costs for 1 - field trips to the Holocaust Museum aligned to increasing student learning = \$1,200 (\$600/ bus x 2 buses) and 1 field trip to the James Museum - \$1,200 (\$600 per bus x 2 buses)</i>			
			3231 - Richard L. Sanders School	UniSIG		\$1,225.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, exceptional/travel: Students will attend field trips to increase learning and the student experience. Estimated admission costs for the Holocaust Museum in St. Petersburg, FL = \$700 (\$10 x 70 x 1 field trip). Estimated admission costs for the James Museum in St. Petersburg, FL = \$525 (\$7.50 x 70 x 1 field trip). Transportation costs are a separate budget line.</i>			

Total:	\$47,500.00
--------	-------------

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No