

Pinellas County Schools

Nina Harris ESE Center School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Nina Harris ESE Center

6000 70TH AVE N, Pinellas Park, FL 33781

<http://www.ninaharris.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

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.

Nina Harris is dedicated to exposing students with special needs to real world academic concepts in a safe, nurturing environment to maximize their success at home, school and in the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% student success.

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
Cassidy, Jacqueline	Principal	The Principal is the instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes, through the hiring, development, support, supervision and retention of high-quality instructional and support staff. As the school leader, the Principal creates a culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families through collaboration and distributive leadership. In alignment with the Florida Principal Standards, the Principal leads the school team to increased school and student outcomes by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing the operational, safety, and policy responsibilities of a school-building leader
Mitchell, Tonya	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is an instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes through staff development and effectiveness. In collaboration with and aligned to the direction of the Principal, the Assistant Principal supports the creation of the culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families throughout the school community. In alignment with the Florida Assistant Principal Standards, the Assistant Principal supports and leads assigned school teams to increased school and student outcomes through ongoing training, coaching, feedback and support by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing operational, safety and policy responsibilities, as assigned.
Thompson, Courtney	Instructional Coach	To provide assistance in the development and coordination of teaching and learning projects with an emphasis on technology, curriculum development and teacher training.
Vaughan, Christina	ELL Compliance Specialist	Compliance, graduation, student support.
Grimes, Jacquie	Behavior Specialist	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.
Avery-Wright, Joycelyn	Teacher, ESE	All duties associated with typical classroom instructors.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bower, Joey	Parent Engagement Liaison	Parent, SAC President
Bell, Vanessa	Instructional Coach	To provide assistance in the development and coordination of teaching and learning projects with an emphasis on technology, curriculum development and teacher training.

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.

At Nina Harris we meet with parents at least 2 time a year to review student education plans and seek input through surveys. We have an active PTO and School Advisory Committee (SAC). We hold school leadership meetings twice a month and the administrative team attends PLC meetings. We have several community businesses that partner with our school to provide supports for our students. We also use surveys to gain information from community and school leaders. At the March SAC meeting we specifically address school improvement and Title 1 initiatives and school needs for the upcoming school year. At the March leadership meeting we continue conversations about progress and needs for the upcoming school year. The entire school staff responds to surveys that are used to provide input on school processes and needs.

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))

We monitor our student's growth 3 times per year to access communication progress and reliability. We provide our students with the State Alternative Assessments; Datafolio and Performance Task. The results of these assessments are generally provided from the state in late July.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-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	92%
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: UNSATISFACTORY 2017-18: 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	3	0	2	2	5	8	2	6	4	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	0	3	3	11	10	11	13	12	66

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	3	0	2	2	5	8	2	6	4	32

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	2	3	7	7	0	5	7	11	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	3	3	10	8	5	12	15	21	193

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	0	0	0	0	0	1	12

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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	2	3	7	7	0	5	7	11	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	3	3	10	8	5	12	15	21	78

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	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	6	63	57	8	70	61
ELA Learning Gains	38	56	55	21	63	59
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile		42	46	38	56	54
Math Achievement*	2	65	55	9	72	62
Math Learning Gains	27	60	60	20	63	59
Math Lowest 25th Percentile		51	56	20	54	52
Science Achievement*	3	58	51	5	64	56
Social Studies Achievement*	5	82	72	7	81	78
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate	100			100		
College and Career Acceleration	0			0		
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	23
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	181
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	89
Graduation Rate	100

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	23	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	0	Yes	3	3
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	8	Yes	3	3
FRL	24	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	6	38		2	27		3	5		100	0	
SWD	6	38		3	27		3	5		100	0	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP								0				
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	14			6			0	12				
FRL	4	47		5	25		5	4		100	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	5	20	20	12	31		0			89	0	
SWD	5	20	20	12	31		0			89	0	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	9	18										
HSP	0	30										
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	5	19		12	33							
FRL	8	17		5	26		0					

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	8	21	38	9	20	20	5	7		100	0	
SWD	8	21	38	9	20	20	5	7		100	0	
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	0	6		0	23		0					
HSP	0	27		6								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	18	30		14	17		5	8				
FRL	5	21		7	25		5	13				

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.

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.

All students at Nina Harris take an alternate assessment; Performance Task or Datafolio. For the purposes of this improvement plan we will refer to the data obtained regarding students who have taken the Performance Task assessment. From this data we can ascertain that math performance was the lowest.

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

All students at Nina Harris take an alternate assessment; Performance Task or Datafolio. For the purposes of this improvement plan we will refer to the data obtained regarding students who have taken the Performance Task assessment. From this data we can ascertain that math performance demonstrated the greatest decline.

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.

There are no state gaps of which to compare our data.

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

All students at Nina Harris take an alternate assessment; Performance Task or Datafolio. For the purposes of this improvement plan we will refer to the data obtained regarding students who have taken the Performance Task assessment. From this data we can ascertain that ELA demonstrated the most improvement.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data, we are always concerned with attendance that is not directly related to medical needs.

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

The highest needs for Nina Harris are improved communication, ELA, Math, and behavior.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

The percent of ESE students who made learning gains will continue to increase above 20% as measured by 2023 - 24 FSAA ELA Performance Task. Our level of performance from the 2023 FSAA Performance Task shows that 44.8% of students were on a Level 1, 48.2% were on Level 2, 3.4% of students were on a Level 3, and 3.4% of the students were on a Level 4. The majority of our students were performing at Level 2 as evidenced in the results of our 2023 FSAA Performance Task scores. A total of 39% of students had made learning gains. The problem of growth was occurring because our Performance Task Level 1 students do have a reliable method of communication in order for the students to be able to express their understanding of the content, however, these Performance Task Level 1 students are still operating at a pre-academic learning level as a result of their intellectual disabilities. During the 2022-2023 school year, students continued to be evaluated as to whether FSAA Performance Task or FSAA Datafolio would be a best fit assessment type. Presently, almost 70% of the student body is assessed via FSAA Datafolio. Due to the state DOE's limited data evaluation tracking system of students' FSAA Datafolio performance, FSAA Datafolio performance information had not been previously monitored. Now that the majority of students are assessed via this type of assessment, the focus item will include both FSAA Performance Task and FSAA Datafolio assessment information once such scores/information is available from the 2022-2023 school year. To strengthen teacher practices, the Nina Harris instructional staff participated in Project Core professional development modules, a book study of Dr. Karen Erickson's Comprehensive Literacy for All during Spring 2022, and a study of implementation of communication instruction and comprehensive literacy instruction via the Readtopia during the 2022-2023 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of ESE students who made learning gains will remain at 20% or better as measured by FSAA Performance Task.

Monitoring:

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

FSAA (Performance Task) score reports and FSAA Datafolio Running Record/Evidence Collection Form student accuracy information collected by teachers to be monitored by Assistant Principal; Student Readtopia levels which measures students' communication and literacy skills (foundational skills for participating in FSAA Performance Task) collected by teachers to be monitored by Instructional Teacher Leader. *All action steps requiring professional development will be monitored through walk-through feedback, direct observations, lesson plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tonya Mitchell (mitchellto@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 strategy being implemented in this ELA areas includes teachers will use direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies (such as visual supports, hands-on materials, core vocabulary supports, sensory-integrated experiences, whole group/small group/individualized instruction, repeated instruction). Project Core/MELD/core vocabulary supports is a classroom-based intervention for students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not use speech, sign language, or symbols to meet a broad range of communication needs. The Tier 1, universal intervention in Project Core calls for modeling the use symbols combined with explicit teaching of the meaning and use of the Universal Core

vocabulary. Modeling and teaching are integrated into daily activities (arrival, mealtime, personal care) instructional routines (shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet knowledge. Teachers will receive instructional use training from Readtopia company Building Wings annually. Communication strategies will be learned in collaboration with Speech Language Pathologist on a monthly basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies includes multiple evidence-based learning strategies to reach the variety of learners with significant cognitive disabilities. The multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) is a three-tiered system for providing communication intervention that offers support to a large number of students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not currently use speech, signs, and/ or symbols to communicate. The first tier of mSAL is focused on the classroom and the classroom teacher using Aided Language Stimulation in a systematic routine. This will help build consistent and reliable modes of communication, so we can accurately assess student progress and determine the most reliable method of assessment.

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.

Staff will participate in PLCs with academic, behavior, and communication focuses facilitated by School Based Leadership Teams to support implementation of the Project Core strategies, Comprehensive Literacy for All literacy strategies, activities, and communication/literacy/academic best practices. Teachers will participate in school wide training days focused on student communication. Teachers will participate in new or refresher training for Readtopia annually and Communication training monthly with SLP support.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Cassidy (cassidyj@pcsb.org)

By When: Annually, Monthly, with PLC minutes as evidence. Training Sign-in sheets. Weekly admin walk-throughs.

Speech Language Pathologists will model the use of a variety of communication modes during lessons/therapy sessions to increase student engagement.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Cassidy (cassidyj@pcsb.org)

By When: Will be documented in SLP's treatment plans. Will be used daily and student progress will be documents in student IEP;s.

Teachers will collect progress monitoring data related to their students' communication and literacy skills as measured by Readtopia's Emergent Literacy Measure

Person Responsible: Courtney Thompson (thompsoncour@pcsb.org)

By When: Data will be taken quarterly and loaded to the Student Data Tracking database.

#2. 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.

The percent of ESE students who make learning gains will to increase above 20% as measured by 2023 - 24 FSAA ELA Performance Task. Our level of performance from the 2023 FSAA Performance Task shows that 55.56% of students were on a Level 1, 37% were on Level 2, 3.7% of students were on a Level 3, and 3.7% of the students were on a Level 4. The majority of our students were performing at Level 1 as evidenced in the results of our 2023 FSAA Performance Task scores. A total of 66.7% of students learning levels remained the same with no learning gains in math. The problem of growth was occurring because our Performance Task Level 1 students do have a reliable method of communication in order for the students to be able to express their understanding of the content, however, these Performance Task Level 1 students are still operating at a pre-academic learning level as a result of their intellectual disabilities. During the 2022-2023 school year, students continued to be evaluated as to whether FSAA Performance Task or FSAA Datafolio would be a best fit assessment type. Presently, almost 70% of the student body is assessed via FSAA Datafolio. Due to the state DOE's limited data evaluation tracking system of students' FSAA Datafolio performance, FSAA Datafolio performance information had not been previously monitored. Now that the majority of students are assessed via this type of assessment, the focus item will include both FSAA Performance Task and FSAA Datafolio assessment information once such scores/information is available from the 2022-2023 school year. To strengthen teacher practices, the Nina Harris instructional staff participated in Project Core professional development modules, a book study of Dr. Karen Erickson's Comprehensive Literacy for All during Spring 2022, and a study of implementation of communication instruction and comprehensive literacy instruction via the Readtopia during the 2022-2023 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of ESE students who make learning gains will increase to 20% or better as measured by FSAA Performance Task.

Monitoring:

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

FSAA (Performance Task and Datafolio) score reports and FSAA Datafolio Running Record/Evidence Collection Form student accuracy information collected by teachers to be monitored by Assistant Principal; Student Readtopia levels which measures students' communication and literacy skills (foundational skills for participating in FSAA Performance Task or Datafolio) collected by teachers to be monitored by Instructional Teacher Leader. *All action steps requiring professional development will be monitored through walk-through feedback, direct observations, lesson plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tonya Mitchell (mitchellto@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 strategy being implemented in this ELA areas includes teachers will use direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies (such as visual supports, hands-on materials, core vocabulary supports, sensory-integrated experiences, whole group/small group/individualized instruction, repeated instruction). Project Core/MELD/core vocabulary supports is a classroom-based intervention for students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not use speech, sign language, or symbols to meet a broad range of communication needs. The Tier 1, universal intervention in Project Core calls for modeling

the use symbols combined with explicit teaching of the meaning and use of the Universal Core vocabulary. Modeling and teaching are integrated into daily activities (arrival, mealtime, personal care) instructional routines (shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet knowledge. Teachers will receive instructional use training from Readtopia company Building Wings annually. Communication strategies will be learned in collaboration with Speech Language Pathologist on a monthly basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies includes multiple evidence-based learning strategies to reach the variety of learners with significant cognitive disabilities. The multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) is a three-tiered system for providing communication intervention that offers support to a large number of students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not currently use speech, signs, and/ or symbols to communicate. The first tier of mSAL is focused on the classroom and the classroom teacher using Aided Language Stimulation in a systematic routine. This will help build consistent and reliable modes of communication, so we can accurately assess student progress and determine the most reliable method of assessment.

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?

No

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.

Teachers will incorporate real world culturally relevant math lessons aligned to the B.E.S.T. Access Points.

Person Responsible: Tonya Mitchell (mitchellto@pcsb.org)

By When: Annually, Monthly through administrative walkthroughs and PLC meeting minutes.

Staff will participate in PLCs with academic, behavior, and communication focuses facilitated by School Based Leadership Teams to support implementation of the Project Core strategies, Comprehensive Literacy for All literacy strategies, activities, and communication/literacy/academic best practices. Admin will attend specific PLC meetings. Teachers will participate in school wide training days focused on student communication. Teachers will participate in new or refresher training.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Cassidy (cassidyj@pcsb.org)

By When: Staff will participate in Monthly PLCs with academic, behavior, and communication focuses facilitated by School Based Leadership Teams to support implementation of the Project Core strategies, Comprehensive Literacy for All literacy strategies, activities, and communication/literacy/academic best practices. Teachers will participate in school wide training days focused on student communication. Teachers will participate in new or refresher training for Readtopia annually and Communication training monthly with SLP support.

Professional Development on how to utilize the Readtopia curriculum and LessonPix (picture symbol program) will be provided to all teachers and relevant support staff on how to use the web-based programs and individualize students' access to enhance the Math standards-based lessons.

Person Responsible: Vanessa Bell (bellva@pcsb.org)

By When: Annually, Monthly support PLC meetings and DWT. Administrative walk-through observations. Training sign-in sheets will be reviewed.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

Many of our black students have very limited consistent or reliable mode of communicating their understanding of learning targets. Through AAC these students are being provided with alternatives to communication. These students require exposure to real world experiences to help them relate to and understand the learning targets and better process and retain information. Based on the 2022 year's FSAA (ELA) results, only 15% of our African American students are currently performing at level 2 or above. To increase proficiency for the 85% that are at Level 1, we will incorporate the use of culturally relevant lesson plans aligned to the standards and continue to develop and refine students' reliable modes of communication, to increase achievement and reduce behaviors.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of black students achieving at performance level 2 or above will increase from 15% to 20% as measured by the FSAA 2023.

Monitoring:

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

Student communication consistency will be monitored quarterly and reported on the student communication database.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Courtney Thompson (thompsoncour@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 strategy being implemented in this area includes direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies (such as visual supports, hands-on materials, core vocabulary supports, sensory-integrated experiences, whole group/small group/individualized instruction, repeated instruction). Project Core/MELD/core vocabulary supports is a classroom-based intervention for students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not use speech, sign language, or symbols to meet a broad range of communication needs. The Tier 1, universal intervention in Project Core calls for modeling the use symbols combined with explicit teaching of the meaning and use of the Universal Core vocabulary. Modeling and teaching are integrated into daily activities (arrival, mealtime, personal care) instructional routines that include real world diverse experiences.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies includes multiple evidence-based learning strategies to reach the variety of learners with significant cognitive disabilities. The multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) is a three-tiered system for providing communication intervention that offers support to a large number of students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not currently use speech, signs, and/ or symbols to communicate. The first tier of mSAL is focused on the classroom and the classroom teacher using Aided Language Stimulation in a systematic routine. This will help build consistent and reliable modes of communication, so we can accurately assess student progress and determine the most reliable method of assessment across various backgrounds and cultures.

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?

No

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.

Teachers will incorporate real-world culturally relevant ELA and social studies lessons aligned to the B.E.S.T. Access Points.

Person Responsible: Tonya Mitchell (mitchellto@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily walkthroughs, lesson plan reviews, and PLC minutes.

Provide opportunity for culturally relevant sensitivity practices to increase student engagement.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Cassidy (cassidyj@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

#4. 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.

The percent of ESE students who made reliability gains in communication will continue to increase above 20% as measured by 2023 - 24 Student Data Communication Database. Our level of performance from the 2022 - 2023 school year was 31.8% Emergent Communicators, 42.8% Consistent communicators, and 25.3% Reliable communicators. The majority of our students were performing at the Consistent communication level. 14.9% of the students made improvements of at least 1 level. 79.8% of the students remained the same, and 5.19% had a decrease in reliability in communication response. Nina Harris instructional staff participated in Project Core professional development modules, a book study of Dr. Karen Erickson's Comprehensive Literacy for All during Spring 2022, and implementation of communication instruction and comprehensive literacy instruction via the Readtopia during the 2022-2023 school year to support student communication.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of ESE students who will make learning gains will increase from 14.9% to 18 % as measured by the Readtopia communication benchmark.

Monitoring:

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

Benchmark will be taken quarterly and the school database will be updated by teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vanessa Bell (bellva@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 strategy being implemented in all areas includes direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies (such as visual supports, hands-on materials, core vocabulary supports, sensory-integrated experiences, whole group/small group/individualized instruction, repeated instruction). Project Core/MELD/core vocabulary supports is a classroom-based intervention for students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not use speech, sign language, or symbols to meet a broad range of communication needs. The Tier 1, universal intervention in Project Core calls for modeling the use symbols combined with explicit teaching of the meaning and use of the Universal Core vocabulary. Modeling and teaching are integrated into daily activities (arrival, mealtime, personal care) instructional routines (shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet, and numbers).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies includes multiple evidence-based learning strategies to reach the variety of learners with significant cognitive disabilities. The multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) is a three-tiered system for providing communication intervention that offers support to a large number of students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not currently use speech, signs, and/ or symbols to communicate. The first tier of mSAL is focused on the classroom and the classroom teacher using Aided Language Stimulation in a systematic routine. This will help build consistent and reliable modes of communication, so we can accurately assess student progress and determine the most reliable method of assessment.

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?

No

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.

Speech Language Pathologists will model the use of a variety of communication modes during lessons/therapy sessions to increase student engagement.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Cassidy (cassidyj@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily, monitored through treatment plans and IEP's.

Teachers will collaborate with Speech Language Pathologists on a variety of communication modes that meet the individual needs of their students.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Cassidy (cassidyj@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly, evidenced in IEP notes.

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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 a base line in 21 -22 there were 1970 behavior calls as taken and documented by the school behavior team. Aggression accounted for 54% of the calls. Out of Area accounted for 21.4% of calls. 12th graders were intervened 484 times. White students accounted for 51.2% of the calls. Since in the introduction of new communication and academic efforts over the past three years the number of behavior calls was decreased by 529. Aggressive call have been reduced by 83 calls. OOA are calls were reduced by 282.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024 the number of behavior calls will be reduced by 20% through continued improvements in communication and academic exposures as measured in the behavior database and other behavior data.

Monitoring:

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

Behavior is monitored on a daily basis. It is reported in IEP's to parents. Administration monitors all behavior and data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tonya Mitchell (mitchellto@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 VBMAApp will continue to be used to monitor student verbal behavior. Improved communication for all students will continue to be a major focus to lead students to gain self-advocacy skills and strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We have a demonstrated improvement in behavior since our introduction of AAC's for all students. A major decrease in OOA from 422 to 282 events, a 66.8% decrease.

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.

Speech Language Pathologists will model the use of a variety of communication modes during lessons/therapy sessions to increase student engagement.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Cassidy (cassidyj@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Teachers will collaborate with Speech Language Pathologists on a variety of communication modes that meet the individual needs of their students.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Cassidy (cassidyj@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly.

Speech Language Pathologists will model the use of a variety of communication modes during lessons/therapy sessions to increase student engagement.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Cassidy (cassidyj@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Teachers will collaborate with Speech Language Pathologists on a variety of communication modes that meet the individual needs of their students.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Cassidy (cassidyj@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly.

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).

Nina Harris has an active School Advisory Committee (SAC). All school improvement fund requests come from the school leadership team, from the staff at large and is presented to the SAC. The SAC discusses SIP spending and votes on spending at SAC meetings.

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.

At Nina Harris we provide our parents with information through multiple methods. We use Title 1 school meetings, SAC meetings, our school website and this year we will add an update in the principals update. We will also add a report to the Parent Teacher Organization.

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))

At Nina Harris we have a vast community of partners. We communicate on our web site and social media and point to point contacts with local businesses and partners.
<https://www.pcsb.org/ninaharris>

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 III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

At Nina Harris all students are students with significant cognitive disabilities. Our number one area of concern is improving communication skills for all students. Through improved communication we see improvements in ELA, Math, and behavior. We intend to continue to improve communication through PD and implementing a standard curriculum.

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))

This plan addresses all students in the school. All students are ESE on and IEP.

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))

All students at Nina Harris are students with significant cognitive delays. No student at Nina Harris has required SBMH services. There is a "girl's group" that supports several girls as a social development support.

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))

All students at Nina Harris are eligible to attend an Extended Transition program until the age of 22 to further their opportunities to enter the work force.

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).

At Nina Harris we have three behavior specialists. One behavior specialist is a Behavior Analyst. We have implemented the VBMap to assess student abilities in behavior. We have active PBIS and MTSS programs.

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))

In the past three years we have completed and will continue to attend many PD's to include ATIA (Communication Conference), Applied Behavior and Registered Behavior Training, Project-Core, Comprehensive Literacy for All book study, and Readtopia Communication and Literacy Curriculum.

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))

N/A

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: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$29,924.30
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5200	640	2581 - Nina Harris ESE Center	UniSIG		\$6,818.63
			<i>Notes: Instruction, exceptional/furniture, fixtures and equipment: The school will purchase student laptops/desktops to enhance their communication options.</i>			
	5200	640	2581 - Nina Harris ESE Center	UniSIG		\$4,515.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, exceptional/furniture, fixtures and equipment: The school would like to purchase a laminator for school use (\$3,915 + \$600 shipping). The school displays posters and student work throughout the school. The ability to laminate student work for display will showcase their achievements, increase in their pride and desire to do great work. This aligns with the school's goals and specifically praises scholars who are demonstrating a successful understanding of what it looks like to be a positive member of the school. Displayed posters will teach and remind students of the school's expectations, thereby promoting positivity throughout the camps.</i>			
	5200	510	2581 - Nina Harris ESE Center	UniSIG		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, exceptional/supplies: Variety of flexible seating for ELA groups for independent reading to increase student engagement. Offering various seating options can ensure the school is meeting the needs of each student's learning style which could decrease negative behaviors. Research shows that children need to move. Flexible seating allows them to wobble, rock, bounce, lean or stand, which increases oxygen flow to the brain, increases blood flow and enhances core strength. In turn, this burns more calories and increases metabolism. It also helps keep young minds more alert and focused.</i>			
	5200	510	2581 - Nina Harris ESE Center	UniSIG		\$16,590.67
			<i>Notes: Instruction, exceptional/supplies: Materials and supplies to support ELA instruction and enhance student communication. Examples include pens, paper, notebooks, ink, toner, lamination film, etc.</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$17,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5200	510	2581 - Nina Harris ESE Center	UniSIG		\$17,500.00

						<i>Notes: Instruction, exceptional/supplies: Materials and supplies to enhance math instruction. Examples include manipulatives and math games to support increased learning gains.</i>
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$1,250.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5200	510	2581 - Nina Harris ESE Center	UniSIG		\$1,250.00
						<i>Notes: Instruction, exceptional/supplies: Materials and supplies to support instructional delivery. Examples include power cords, power cubes, etc.</i>
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$19,511.95
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	330	2581 - Nina Harris ESE Center	UniSIG		\$2,000.00
						<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/travel: Attendance by two staff members at the 2024 BSI summer conference. Estimated costs include lodging \$600 (\$200/night x 3 nights), food \$192 (\$62 x 3 days), and mileage/parking \$208. Total cost per attendee = \$1,000 x 2 attendees = \$2,000.</i>
	6400	330	2581 - Nina Harris ESE Center	UniSIG		\$15,738.00
						<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/travel: The school would like to send one administrator and one instructional leader to the Harvard School Turnaround Leaders Conference. This conference is normally held in June in Cambridge, MA. The two staff members attending are considered leaders at the school and this program will provide the tools needed to bring about rapid and sustained change at Nina Harris ESE Center. The school's objectives are to: gain the skills to develop rapid, well thought out improvement action plans, to understand how data-driven decisions can be used to set strategy and assess progress, to learn how transforming school culture fosters high-quality education and to acquire strategies to communicate the school's vision to stakeholders. These objectives match the focus of the conference. Total travel costs (for this five-day program for two staff are \$16,512 and include registration \$7,990 (\$3,995 x2), lodging \$4,584 (6 nights for 2 rooms x 382), airfare \$1,746 (\$873 x 2), meals \$768 (\$64/day x 6 days x 2), and ground transportation/parking \$650.</i>
	5200	510	2581 - Nina Harris ESE Center	UniSIG		\$1,773.95
						<i>Notes: Instruction, exceptional/supplies: Materials and supplies that support instructional delivery and encourage positive behavior.</i>
					Total:	\$71,250.00

Budget Approval

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

No