

Pinellas County Schools

# Richard L. Sanders School



## 2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                     | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                      | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                        | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>                | <b>11</b> |
| <b>R.A.I.S.E</b>                               | <b>22</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>      | <b>25</b> |

## Richard L. Sanders School

5025 76TH AVE N, Pinellas Park, FL 33781

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

### Demographics

**Principal: Heidi D'ambrosio**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2021-22 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Function</b><br>(per accountability file)  | ESE  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>KG-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Special Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | <i>[Data Not Available]</i>  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Black/African American Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>Students With Disabilities<br>White Students |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   | 2018-19: Maintaining<br>2017-18: Maintaining<br>2016-17: Unsatisfactory<br>2015-16: No Rating                          |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating</b>   | 2021-22: No Rating   |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

### SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

## Part 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

#### **Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.**

Richard L. Sanders School (RLSS) is a public, (K-12), exceptional student education (ESE) center, serving students with disabilities (i.e, students with severe behavioral and/or mental health concerns). A notable percentage of the student population is designated as homeless or in foster care, and enter RLSS with documented mental health services and involvement with additional outside support agencies. Accordingly, RLSS is a designated title I center and 100% of its students receive free/reduced prices lunch. Although Early Warning Systems (EWS) indicators (e.g., attendance, ISS, OSS, arrests, ODR) are exhibiting positive, year-to-years trends, the overall data suggests disparate exposure to Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) are an ongoing impediment to student achievement. To address the impacts ACEs have on students' performance, behavior and overall well-being, RLSS staff, meets its students' diverse needs through a comprehensive array of supports and services, which among others, include: reliance on the "Equity with Excellence for All" strategic model as a means of bridging the achievement gaps, many of our minority students must navigate on their path toward proficiency; the implementation of the revised Florida Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (FLPBIS) to help students, parents and staff better track students' social emotional growth; as well as engagement in Restorative Practices and Trauma Informed Care Trainings, so students and staff have a better understanding of each others' social-emotional needs. It is hoped the strategic and consistent application of these resources will foster a climate of continuous learning, where students and teachers are well-equipped to track academic performance, identify and analyze behavioral gains, and monitor and self-regulate social emotional learning.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, 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              |                                 |
| Mitchell, Tonya    | Assistant Principal    |                                 |
| Bradley, Frederick | Teacher, ESE           |                                 |
| Conner, Lacie      | Teacher, ESE           |                                 |
| Lowry, Dana        | Behavior Specialist    |                                 |
| Gaynier, Gregory   | Teacher, ESE           |                                 |
| Parker, Megan      | Other                  | Social Worker                   |
| Brown, Kim         | Assistant Principal    |                                 |
| Dubois, MaryBeth   | Attendance/Social Work |                                 |
| McClory, Sara      | Teacher, ESE           |                                 |

**Is education provided through contract for educational services?**

No

**If yes, name of the contracted education provider.**

NA

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Saturday 7/1/2017, Heidi D'ambrosio

**Total number of students enrolled at the school.**

66

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.**

22

**Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?**

20

**Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?**

2

**Number of teachers with ESE certification?**

18

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

5

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

5

**Demographic Data**

### Early Warning Systems

**2022-23**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 9  | 3  | 2  | 59    |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8  | 5 | 4 | 6  | 2  | 0  | 33    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7  | 3 | 5 | 5  | 2  | 0  | 33    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7  | 4 | 2 | 7  | 2  | 0  | 27    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3  | 3 | 2 | 5  | 1  | 1  | 20    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3  | 3 | 3 | 5  | 2  | 0  | 19    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2  | 4 | 3 | 4  | 2  | 0  | 18    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 8  | 2  | 0  | 42    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 1  | 2     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1  | 0  | 0  | 7     |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 7/7/2022

**2021-22 - Updated**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 8  | 9 | 11 | 9  | 5  | 1  | 4  | 64    |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6  | 5 | 7  | 8  | 4  | 0  | 1  | 38    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 6 | 12 | 13 | 3  | 0  | 5  | 63    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3  | 6 | 6  | 9  | 4  | 3  | 0  | 34    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3  | 7 | 7  | 9  | 6  | 2  | 0  | 37    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 3  | 0  | 1     | 41 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 3  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 7  |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 70%      | 61%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 63%      | 59%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 56%      | 54%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 72%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 63%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 54%      | 52%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 64%      | 56%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       |        |          |       |        | 81%      | 78%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 56%      | -56%                       | 58%   | -58%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |



| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 56%      | -56%                       | 58%   | -58%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 54%      | -54%                       | 56%   | -56%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 10%    | 51%      | -41%                       | 54%   | -44%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 51%      | -51%                       | 52%   | -52%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -10%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 55%      | -55%                       | 56%   | -56%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 62%      | -62%                       | 62%   | -62%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 64%      | -64%                       | 64%   | -64%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 60%      | -60%                       | 60%   | -60%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 44%      | -44%                       | 55%   | -55%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 60%      | -60%                       | 54%   | -54%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 31%      | -31%                       | 46%   | -46%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 54%      | -54%                       | 53%   | -53%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 0%     | 51%      | -51%                       | 48%   | -48%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 0%     | 62%      | -62%                  | 67%   | -67%               |
| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 0%     | 68%      | -68%                  | 71%   | -71%               |
| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 0%     | 70%      | -70%                  | 70%   | -70%               |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 0%     | 55%      | -55%                  | 61%   | -61%               |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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 |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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 |
| SWD                                       | 10       | 31     |             | 12        | 24      |              | 13       | 25      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 11       | 33     |             | 19        | 28      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 11       | 29     |             | 6         | 15      |              | 10       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 6        | 31     |             | 9         | 21      |              | 17       | 17      |           |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 |

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | N/A |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    |     |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       |     |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  |     |
| Percent Tested  |     |
| Subgroup Data   |     |

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Data Analysis**  
 Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?**

RLSS's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) underperforming subgroups are Black/African American, White, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students. In addition, all of our Black/African American and White students are included in both the Students with Disabilities and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. Every student at RLSS has an annually reviewed Individualized Education Plan (IEP), and staff regularly analyze and evaluate student progress monitoring data,

academic grades, behavioral performance, and attendance. The latter of which, is further scrutinized twice per month by the Child Study Team (CST). In addition, teachers/case managers continuously utilize this data when planning, during instruction, and when formatively assessing student progress. At the administrative level, the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) relies on a data-driven dialog protocol and continuous improvement cycle model to analyze data, identify barriers, and design actionable next steps. Finally, organizationally, School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals and action steps are reviewed mid-year and adjustments made according to most recent available data.

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

RLSS students made ELA and Math learning gains (i.e., percent proficiency as measured by state-wide assessment) in 2019, as was evident in progress monitoring and state-wide assessment data. While this is indicative of progress, we acknowledge the need for action steps to ensure students across grade levels, and content areas, improve achievement outcomes, and continue their march toward proficiency. Additional steps are warranted considering, the post-pandemic decline in learning gains RLSS students experienced during the (2020-2021) school year (ELA from 45% to 31% and Math from 38% to 22%). Additionally, the following year, (2021-2022) data showed a decline in ELA (26% from 31%), and the Math gains made (22% to 29%), failed to exceed pre-pandemic proficiency (38%). Although the job is not yet finished, gains were made, and students did learn. Accordingly, the following have been identified as contributors to improved learning outcomes: staff dedication, bridging students' home and school lives, interagency collaboration, the implementation of morning circles, and PBIS support. Moreover, this understanding was considered when developing "new actions" relevant to building positive classroom culture, which consisted of incorporating restorative practices and the House Model into efforts aimed at promoting a more positive school-wide climate. To assist with the latter, we worked to implement high-leverage strategies supporting productive student-centered learning, used data-based planning to address gaps in achievement, better organized students to engage with content, and promoted engagement strategies aimed at improving student/teacher self-efficacy.

**What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?**

An increase in reading proficiency is at the top of the list of our students most pressing academic needs. This is because reading is a foundational skill, which students must master to build competency across core academic areas. However, societal, environmental, home, and mental health factors have inhibited many of our students' opportunity to develop strong foundational reading skills. New arrivals to our school often lack early literacy skills, and perform a grade or two (or more) below their designated grade-level (an assertion verified by several reading inventories highlighting these deficiencies). During the (2021-2022) school year we approached this need by assigning, one teacher and paraprofessional to focus on reading interventions across grade levels and monitor student progress. Additionally, all middle school students were enrolled in a reading course aimed at improving their skills in preparation for high school core courses.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

Standardized assessment and progress monitoring data for the (2021-2022) data and progress monitoring assessments, students are making learning gains but remain below proficiency. Approximately 71.2% of students enrolled at RLSS, meet two or more early warning indicators for on-time graduation. Overall, school-wide attendance hovers around 70.7%. In addition, when delineated by subgroup (i.e., Black/African American, White, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged), our student body is performing below the ESSA index threshold of 41%. This trend carries over to achievement in core content areas, where most of our student population is performing below proficiency.

**What strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

Learning will be accelerated via implementation of the actions and strategies above, and continuously working to improve their rate of fidelity and monitoring. It is hoped this increased scrutiny, along with a renewed focus on student/teacher data chats, will allow us to better target student needs. Moreover, we will utilize the expertise of our staff, and district staff developers (delineated by grade level and content area) as they collaborate to analyze student achievement data in monthly PLCs.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders.**

The first half of our (2022-2023) school year will include a variety of training sessions and monthly PLCs aimed at developing a common language across our school and utilizing CHAMPs strategies. These professional development opportunities are part of a greater effort of having RLSS earn a "trauma sensitive school" designation.

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**

Although, 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). Meanwhile, standardized math assessment data for (2021-2022) shows 29% of our students achieved learning gains (a 7% increase over the prior year).

**Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

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

As it pertains to science achievement on state-wide assessments (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 2023.

Civics EOC data for the (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 (12.5%) scored a level 5; and 1 student (12.5%) 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 (50% scored a 2 or higher) on the U.S. History EOC.

African American students make up 50% of our student population, and are experiencing similar learning gains when compare to the other ESSA subgroups. In order to bridge the gap, we need to increase the ELA and Math proficiency of our African American learners.

**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; Civics EOC from 25% (2021-2022) to 50%, by May 2023; US History EOC from 33% (2021-2022) to 50%, by May 2023; Elementary and Middle School Science from 0% (2021-2022) to 50%, by May 2023; Biology EOC from 37.5% (2021-2022) to 50%, by May 2023; Civics EOC from 25% (2021-2022) to 50%, by May 2023; US History EOC from 33% (2021-2022) to 50%, by May 2023.

Our goal particular to bridging the gap is for 65% of our African American learners to be proficient in ELA, Math, Social Studies, and Science, 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 MAP and Cycle Assessments. We will also meet monthly with the Reading Intervention Teacher to review the development of students' skills and use of literacy strategies. Progress toward math proficiency will be documented and analyzed using IReady and Cycle Assessment data. Progress for Science and Civics/U.S. History will be monitored via state-administered cycle assessments and supplemented with alternative formative assessments. These monitoring tools will also be utilized to guide the progress of our African American students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Shante Flowers (flowerssh@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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**

**Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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.

**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** Shante Flowers (flowerssh@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** Tonya Mitchell (mitchellto@pcsb.org)

Ensure consistent and equitable application of instructional support for direct instruction (district supplied resources) and independent learning (i.e., iReady, Elevate, IXL).

**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 (i.e., text marking and purposeful writing) 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)

**Monitoring ESSA**

**Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA

subgroups not meeting  
the 41% threshold  
according to the Federal  
Index.



**#2. Other specifically relating to College and Career Readiness**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

During the 2021-2022 school year four - 12th grade students were eligible for graduation. All of these students participated in their individualized education plan (IEP) meetings and goal development, and two were recommended and referred to extended transition services. We expect our performance level to be 60% or greater by April 2023.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The percentage of students participating in vocational, or college preparatory/ coaching programs will increase from 50% (1 out 2 students in the graduating cohort) to 60%, as measured by course transcripts, IEPs, College/Career Entrance Exam Data, and ACT/SAT data by May 2023.

**Monitoring:**

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

Monitoring for desired outcomes will be achieved by utilizing course transcripts, IEPs (including vocational rehabilitation information), and completion of college/career entrance exams.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Strengthening stakeholders' understanding of the pathways to graduation (HS), increasing student participation in college and career readiness opportunities, and supporting student tracking of individual progress.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Focusing SIP efforts on strengthening stakeholders' understanding of the pathways to graduation (HS), increasing student participation in college and career readiness opportunities, and supporting student progress tracking will result in increased enrollment in career and college courses.

**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.

Annually review student IEPs to ensure stakeholders understand the graduation progression and vocational/college preparatory program options.

**Person Responsible**

Kam Rigney (rigneyk@pcsb.org)

Ensure that every student is referred to, has the option to participate in, and has a well-developed understanding of, career assessment or vocational rehabilitation support prior to graduation, and how these services can support their future goals.

**Person Responsible**

Kam Rigney (rigneyk@pcsb.org)

Increase participation in pre-college exams by offering SAT/ACT/Career Readiness coursework.

**Person Responsible**

Tonya Mitchell (mitchellto@pcsb.org)

Monitor student academic performance and enrollment to ensure equitable access to rigorous courses and/or preparatory programs.

**Person Responsible**

Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

Relating classroom content to career and college readiness.

**Person Responsible**

Frederick Bradley (bradleyf@pcsb.org)

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

**#3. 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 critical need from the data reviewed.

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 MAP 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:**

Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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  
Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the

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.

resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

**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** Tonya Mitchell (mitchellto@pcsb.org)

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

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

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

**Person Responsible** Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@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** Lacie Conner (connerl@pcsb.org)

**Monitoring ESSA**

**Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

**#4. Other specifically relating to Graduation Rate****Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

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

Graduation rate varies from year to year at our facility and during the (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.

Our graduation rate will increase from 50% (2018-19) to 100% as measured by PCS Graduation Cohort Report data and the Federal Percent of Points Index report by May 2023.

**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.

**Person  
responsible for  
monitoring  
outcome:**

Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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  
Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria

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.

used for selecting this strategy.

**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.

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)

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

**Person Responsible** Heidi D'Ambrosio (dambrosioh@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)

**Monitoring ESSA**

**Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

**RAISE**

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

NA

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

According to the 2022 FSA data, less than 50% of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 scored proficient. (3rd-80% not proficient, 4th- 100% not proficient, and 5th-84% not proficient) Our students continue to struggle with writing cohesive essays, reading fluency, and reading comprehension.

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

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

NA

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

Students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will increase learning gains to 65% and at least 75% of students will score proficient by May 2023.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.



Our school will utilize FAST, MAP, and Cycle assessments to monitor student learning in reading and writing.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

D'Ambrosio, Heidi, dambrosioh@pcsb.org

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

1. Increased independent reading time -by increasing the amount of time they are independently reading, they have more opportunity to use the strategies they are learning through their other interventions.
2. Systematic Phonics and Decoding - if a child is able to correctly identify which sounds go with which letters, they can almost sound out any word in the English language. A mini lesson for the student every day as they tackle mastering their phonics skills.
3. Repeated reading -their fluency rate will improve automatically and their comprehension of the material will get better. By doing repeated readings often enough, their fluency will eventually improve across the board with even new text.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Implementing increased independent reading time, systematic phonics and decoding, and repeated reading, the students fluency and comprehension will increase.



**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring      |
|--|--|
| Professional learning and PLC work will focus around reading fluency and comprehension. Teachers will be expected to provide data on independent reading, repeated reading, and systematic phonics and decoding. | Flowers, Shante, flowerssh@pcsb.org    |
| Training will be provided during PLCs around these three target areas by instructional staff developers from the elementary ESE team.  | D'Ambrosio, Heidi, dambrosioh@pcsb.org |

**Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

**Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.**

PBIS linked to classroom management strategies

**Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.**

Our level of performance according to school-wide behavior details the following: In School Suspensions (ISS) during recent school year, (2019-2020) 182 total, 1.61 per student; (2020-2021) 160 total, 1.70 per student; and (2021-2022) 68 total, 0.77 per student; Out of School Suspensions (OSS), (2019-2020) 72 total, 0.64 per student; (2020-2021) 69 total, 0.73 per student; and (2021-2022) 93 total, 1.06 per student. We expect our numbers of ISSs to decrease from the collective average of previous school years of approximately 137 (2019-2022) to at most 50; OSS to decrease from the collective average of previous school years of approximately 78 (2019-2022) to 80 or below as measured by the end of the year data from the PCS School Profile Dashboard by May 2023. 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 the following: 1) FLPBIS, 2) Tier 1 PBIS walkthrough with restorative practices components, 3) benchmark of quality, 4) tiered fidelity inventory, and 5) self-assessment with multi-tiered system of supports.

**Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.**

Critical to this process is the consultation with various stakeholders (proximal and broad) as we employ school improvement strategies aimed at promoting a positive school culture and environment. Proximal stakeholders promote a positive culture via communication and relationship building. Teachers, support staff and administration engage in constant collaboration aimed at ensuring students are participating in an educative process that is fundamentally sound, adaptive, equitable, and safe. Students' families are also a large part of this process and meet with school-based stakeholders on a regular basis during IEP meetings. To further foster this relationship, parents and families can readily contact teachers, social workers, behavioral specialists, and administrators. Additionally, a team comprised of a DMT, VE specialist, social work, behavioral specialist, and an administrator, welcome new families to our school and encourage them to reach out if they need assistance. We also communicate with our families through flyers, newsletters, connected messages, our website, home visits, and school-based events. The broader stakeholders provide students with continued support outside of school hours. Early childhood and social service providers help students receive required care and supervision. Community college and university partnerships train future educators, assist students on their college track, and develop ways to improve teaching and learning. Local businesses and volunteer organizations help our school provide tangible incentives for promoting students' academic and social success. Both types of stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. This is because they provide vital counsel as we formulate our vision statement, mission, values, goals, and school improvement strategies.

### **Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.**

We are continuing to increase the use of PBIS as well as a house-based system to increase the positive culture school wide. As evidenced by the PBIS framework, the Tier 1 indicates that active and explicit teaching of school-wide expectations clarifies concepts for students and adults, allowing for practice/ performance feedback, and reduces misunderstandings regarding what is appropriate at school. Integrating and aligning restorative elements with PBIS will enhance the effectiveness of the system. The house model creates a strong support system that helps students feel safe and part of a larger team. By increasing our strategies and improving overall school climate and culture, we should see a decrease in challenging behaviors that result in consequences (i.e. – ISS and OSS). School profiles and progress based on area of focus will be reviewed monthly during School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) meetings for monitoring of school-wide behavior.

### **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.

| Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring                 |
|--|---|
| <p>By July of 2022, school staff will develop training for preschool to ensure that teachers implement lessons plans that integrate expectations that are aligned with the guidelines of success: "Eagles are compassionate, courageous, mindful, restorative, and resilient".</p>   | <p>D'Ambrosio, Heidi,<br/>dambrosioh@pcsb.org</p> |
| <p>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.</p>  |   |
| <p>The PBIS coordinator will provide professional development to staff on the pre-corrective/ surface classroom management technique for commonly used instructional activities using a CHAMPS model. This includes PLC workshops as well as individual coaching to tier supports based on the needs of the teachers.</p>  |   |
| <p>During the first quarter, all staff will be trained in how to develop lesson plans to teach/re-teach classroom rules and procedures using restorative circles and how to use impromptu conversations for in the moment teaching of expectations. Staff will review expectations proactively within designated windows throughout the year and responsively as issues arise within the class as well as adjustments if needed to determine fair process. All staff monitoring student behavior in common areas will engage with students to provide feedback, both positive and corrective, and will refer to signage reflecting the given 'Guidelines for Success'. Ratios of reinforcement/acknowledgement of appropriate behavior to correction will be monitored to achieve a minimum of 4 positive to every 1 negative. The restorative practices trainer will provide resources and modeling on how to incorporate use of affective language when providing positive praise and corrective feedback.</p> |   |
| <p>For the incoming 2022-2023 school year, we will be implementing a new program, Conscious Discipline, which is a trauma-informed, brain-based self-regulation program combining discipline, social-emotional learning, and school climate into one integrated process. This is done through the concept of transformation change that boasts creating a new mindset where it replaces the inaccurate traditional view of social and academic learning into a whole learner mindset, where academics is combined with the way children interact with their world and what happens as a result. This asks our staff to see misbehavior as a call for help, conflict as a teaching opportunity, children as capable of self-regulation, as well as connection as the most powerful motivating force of achievement.</p>   |   |