Oak Grove Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Oak Grove Middle School

1370 S BELCHER RD, Clearwater, FL 33764

http://www.oakgrove-ms.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.

To provide an equitable learning experience for all students and prepare all students for high school, college, career, and life.

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
Alford, Christopher	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal over school wide professional development, athletics, math and transportation.
Mallory, Karen	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum, ESOL, and electives.
Oleksy, Mariah	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of safety, science and ESE.
Therrien, Kristy	Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

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

Our SIP is developed based on our ongoing monitoring of our progress toward meeting our goals. The Leadership team has met with our instructional coaches and AVID coordinators to establish our focus for this school year, We have gathered feedback from parents throughout the year via surveys and utilize this input to create our schoolwide goals.

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 meet weekly with our leadership team (Instructional coaches, administration and behavior specialist) to monitor our progress toward established goals. Our goals and strategies will be our focus and guide conversations and observations. Data will be analyzed on an ongoing basis to monitor progress toward achieving our goals.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	65%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
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)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	63	99	225
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4	24
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	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	115	116	340
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	78	87	258
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	115	116	340

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	50	47	136

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	68	61	213
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	129	130	362
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	125	93	336
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	129	130	362

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	0	

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	3	7	1	11
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	68	61	213
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	129	130	362
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	125	93	336
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	129	130	362

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	39	50	47	136

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	3	7	1	11
Students retained two or more times	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*	34	45	50	38	52	54
ELA Learning Gains	36	43	48	47	55	54
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30	32	38	42	47	47
Math Achievement*	37	51	54	43	55	58
Math Learning Gains	39	52	58	47	52	57
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39	48	55	40	46	51
Science Achievement*	33	45	49	43	51	51
Social Studies Achievement*	56	64	71	60	68	72
Middle School Acceleration	63			56		
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	45			41		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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%
	2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY			
SWD	21	Yes	3	3
ELL	32	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	29	Yes	3	1
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL	39	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	38	Yes	1	

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)

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
	2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
All Students	34	36	30	37	39	39	33	56	63			45
SWD	7	24	26	10	26	28	12	36				17
ELL	20	27	23	28	31	32	14	45	58			45
AMI												
ASN	63	60		72	59							
BLK	19	33	27	19	35	35	13	44	33			
HSP	29	32	26	34	34	35	28	49	58			44
MUL	34	30		32	38		30		70			
PAC												
WHT	44	40	37	48	45	47	45	66	70			40
FRL	29	32	29	34	38	38	28	51	58			47

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	37	42	36	41	41	37	46	56	72			46
SWD	8	22	22	11	30	31	14	32				19
ELL	22	36	38	30	36	42	21	42	50			46
AMI												
ASN	61	61		83	72							
BLK	24	31	18	26	37	34	23	54	69			
HSP	29	39	39	36	38	37	36	49	65			45
MUL	52	56		44	38		53	69	64			
PAC												
WHT	47	46	44	49	45	38	59	60	76			50
FRL	32	38	34	37	39	34	37	50	66			49

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	38	47	42	43	47	40	43	60	56			41
SWD	13	36	32	16	33	31	28	20	36			37
ELL	18	39	40	29	36	32	19	37	35			41
AMI												
ASN	71	50		79	62							
BLK	29	44	48	26	40	46	34	42	53			
HSP	30	44	40	37	42	35	35	49	54			41
MUL	46	50		53	54		80	54	64			
PAC												
WHT	47	49	45	52	53	44	48	76	56			38
FRL	32	44	41	38	42	34	38	50	50			40

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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	33%	48%	-15%	47%	-14%
08	2023 - Spring	34%	47%	-13%	47%	-13%
06	2023 - Spring	30%	47%	-17%	47%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	37%	58%	-21%	54%	-17%
07	2023 - Spring	23%	36%	-13%	48%	-25%
08	2023 - Spring	42%	61%	-19%	55%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	29%	47%	-18%	44%	-15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	53%	28%	50%	31%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	46%	37%	48%	35%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	54%	68%	-14%	66%	-12%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Our Science showed the lowest proficiency at 29%. We were unable to find and hire a science teacher for 8 months of the school year. Our other 8th grade science teacher was new to the state.

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

Our science data showed the greatest decline moving from 35% proficient to 29% proficient. We were without a science teacher for 8 months of the school year. Although we combined classes and provided supports it did not meet the needs of the scholars.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our 8th grade science scores displayed a 15% gap from the statewide average. We were without a science teacher for 8 months of the school year. Although we combined classes and provided supports it did not meet the needs of the scholars.

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

Our Alg 1H data showed the most improvement, 19%. We had a math interventionist work with scholars, and our assistant principal worked side by side with the Algebra teachers and focused on tier 1 instruction.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data for our school, areas of concern are ELA Reading and Math proficiency. We will be striving to reduce the number of Level 1s in ELA Reading and Math.

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

1. ELA Reading proficiency/learning gains.
2. Science proficiency
3. EL Scholars proficiency/learning gains
4. SWD scholars proficiency/learning gains.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 8% of teachers leave the profession yearly and another 8% move to other schools, bringing the total annual turnover rate to 16%. As the 2022-2023 school year ended and the 2023-2024 school year approached, 15 new instructional staff were hired of the 41 allocated due to resignations and transfers, which placed our turnover rate at 37%.

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

We expect our recruitment and retention rate to decrease from 37% to 16%.

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

Quarterly staff survey focusing on culture and climate. Bimonthly restorative circles participation and feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristy Therrien (therrienk@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.)

We will celebrate teachers bimonthly Increase teacher involvement in decision making.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we focus on Core Values Recognition, listening to our teachers, and supporting them, the recruitment and retention rate would be reduced by 21%

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.

We will recognize our staff utilizing Core Cash at every meeting, PLC, PBIS Rewards when they need to be recognized. Teacher of the Month will be announced and weekly shoutouts in the newsletter.
We will hold a focus group that focuses on teacher voice and building positive culture.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

Accelerating Learning through Data-Driven Instruction: Planning benchmark-aligned lessons based on analysis of recent data: both summative and formative. Increase scholar ownership and presentation of their data and goals.
Accelerating Learning through High expectations: Conditions for learning will be established, taught, modeled, and monitored in all classrooms. This structure will lead to increased scholars actively engaged in the learning process.
Accelerating Learning through School-wide Literacy: Reading and writing across all content areas with the utilization of core content vocabulary across all subjects. Instruction and scheduling of scholars based on reading screenings provided to all sixth-grade scholars.
Our current level of performance is 29%, as evidenced in SSA proficiency (level 3 and above).The gap is occurring because data is not being utilized and students are struggling to read and comprehend the content, and unstructured classroom environments.

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

The percent of 8th grade students achieving science proficiency will increase from 29% to 40%, as measured by 8th grade Science State-Wide Science Assessment

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

Bimonthly PLC's, Cycle assessments, formative assessments, walkthroughs, data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@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.)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which scholars are required to read and write in response to text in a highly organized and engaging classroom setting.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If effective implementation of literacy strategies with an emphasis on content specific vocabulary based on formative data would occur, proficiency would increase by 11%.

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.

Training teachers during preschool on how to implement reading (BUC) and writing instruction during daily lessons.
Provide professional development on classroom engagement strategies connected with class management strategies.
Professional development on pulling data.
Administration and instructional coaches will plan with teams and provide support in classrooms.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Bimonthly PLC common planning. implementing the data, literacy strategies imbedded. Fous on vocabulary development.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#3. 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.

Accelerating Learning through Data-Driven Instruction: Planning benchmark-aligned lessons based on analysis of recent data: both summative and formative. Increase scholar ownership and presentation of their data and goals.
Accelerating Learning through High expectations: Conditions for learning will be established, taught, modeled, and monitored in all classrooms. This structure will lead to increased scholars actively engaged in the learning process.
Accelerating Learning through School-wide Literacy: Reading and writing across all content areas with the utilization of core content vocabulary across all subjects. Instruction and scheduling of scholars based on reading screenings provided to all sixth-grade scholars.
Our current level of performance is 32% of our students are proficient on the 2023 FAST PM 3. The gap is occurring because data is not being utilized and students are struggling to read and comprehend the content, and unstructured classroom environments.

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

We expect our performance level to increase from 32% to 40% of our scholars meeting proficiency by Spring 2024 Progress Monitoring assessment F.A.S.T.

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

Bimonthly PLC's, Cycle assessments, formative assessments, walkthroughs, data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristy Therrien (therrienk@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.)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which scholars are required to read and write in response to text in a highly organized and engaging classroom setting.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If effective implementation of literacy strategies with an emphasis on content specific vocabulary based on formative data would occur, proficiency would increase by 8%

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.

Use state and district resources (such as the BEST ELA Standards and PCS Gold Document) to synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications, and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Purposefully combine/stack standards and benchmarks to support learning so that a benchmark is spotlighted and supporting benchmarks (such as ELA Expectations) that enhance instruction are incorporated in the lesson to meet the demands of the spotlighted benchmark.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Use district curriculum resources to provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content, knowledge-building, and tasks aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark; and make strategic decisions about implementation of the curriculum to maximize impact on student learning.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

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

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Ensure instructional supports are in place for all students during core instruction, including supports for students with exceptional needs, English Language supports, as well as extensions/more advanced texts for students above benchmark. These supports include access to grade-level text and beyond as well as small group instruction based on data.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback ensuring ample time is given to students to read and write appropriate grade-level t4ext (while applying foundational skills) with high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to ameliorate gaps early.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#4. 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.

Accelerating Learning through Data-Driven Instruction: Planning benchmark-aligned lessons based on analysis of recent data: both summative and formative. Increase scholar ownership and presentation of their data and goals.
Accelerating Learning through High expectations: Conditions for learning will be established, taught, modeled, and monitored in all classrooms. This structure will lead to increased scholars actively engaged in the learning process.
Accelerating Learning through School-wide Literacy: Reading and writing across all content areas with the utilization of core content vocabulary across all subjects. Instruction and scheduling of scholars based on reading screenings provided to all sixth-grade scholars.
Our current level of performance is 42% of our students are proficient on the 2023 FAST PM 3. The gap is occurring because there isn't student ownership of data with fidelity, students aren't exposed to enough achievement level three word problems, and unstructured classroom environments are in existence.

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

The percent of students achieving math proficiency will increase from 42% to 50%, as measured by the F.A.S.T mathematics assessment.

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

Bimonthly PLC's, Cycle assessments, formative assessments, walkthroughs, data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Alford (alfordch@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.)

Scholars will track their own individual data as a way to monitor progress towards mastery of each specific benchmark. Teachers will also track individual, benchmark-based data and develop collaborative data-driven instructional decisions. Targeted interventions will occur based on the data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If students and teachers have ownership of their data and make data-driven decisions, proficiency would increase by 8%.

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.

Weekly planning sessions and bi-weekly PLCs inclusive of planning benchmark-aligned lessons and tasks based on an analysis of formative assessment data. Data will come from the FAST PM assessments, IXL, McGraw-Hill and/or teacher/district-created assessments.

Person Responsible: Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

By When: August 18th

Administrators, math coach and teachers wil engage in mathematics-focused learning walks & discussions with a focus on target/task alighment and differentiated learning opportunities for students.

Person Responsible: Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

By When: September 30th

Teachers will utilize IXL to have students practice benchmark aligned skills to achieve proficiency or mastery on at least 1 grade-level skill per week.

Person Responsible: Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

By When: Week of August 18

Teachers will promote student ownership and agency of their own data and goals. Students will track their own-data in their notebook. Overall class data trends will be posted on classroom data wall.

Person Responsible: Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

By When: September 1

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

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

Accelerating Learning through Data-Driven Instruction: Planning benchmark-aligned lessons based on analysis of recent data: both summative and formative. Increase scholar ownership and presentation of their data and goals.
Accelerating Learning through High expectations: Conditions for learning will be established, taught, modeled, and monitored in all classrooms. This structure will lead to increased scholars actively engaged in the learning process.
Accelerating Learning through School-wide Literacy: Reading and writing across all content areas with the utilization of core content vocabulary across all subjects. Instruction and scheduling of scholars based on reading screenings provided to all sixth-grade scholars.
Our current level of performance is 54% of our students are proficient on the 2023 Civics EOC. The gap is occurring because data is not being utilized and students are struggling to read and comprehend the content, and unstructured classroom environments.

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

The percent of students achieving proficiency on the Civics EOC will be 60%, as measured by the spring administration of the Civics EOC.

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

Bimonthly PLC's, Cycle assessments, formative assessments, walkthroughs, data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Mallory (malloryk@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.)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which scholars are required to read and write in response to text in a highly organized and engaging classroom setting.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If effective implementation of literacy strategies with an emphasis on content specific vocabulary based on formative data would occur, proficiency would increase by 6%

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.

Training teachers during preschool on how to implement reading (BUC) and writing instruction during daily lessons.
Provide professional development on classroom engagement strategies connected with class management strategies.
Professional development on pulling data.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Preschool

Weekly common planning PLCs to review scholar work (instructional activities and formative assessments), create appropriate lesson plans using district documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, standards-aligned resources, DBQs, etc.) that incorporate cognitively complex tasks aligned to the target.

Person Responsible: Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers monitor mastery of standards and provide feedback to scholars to support learning. Use a common instrument for students track and reflect on their data, including sections which allow student reflection and "next steps."

Person Responsible: Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Strategic scheduling of 7th and 8th grade scholars in Civics classes, providing opportunities for them to excel in an academic environment appropriate to their assessed level. Bilingual assistants will provide support to students who have not yet achieved proficiency on state standards.

Person Responsible: Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

By When: Preschool and ongoing

Engage students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback ensuring ample time is given to scholars to read and write appropriate grade-level Civics content (while applying foundational skills) with high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback.

Person Responsible: Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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.

Accelerating Learning through Data-Driven Instruction: Planning benchmark-aligned lessons based on analysis of recent data: both summative and formative. Increase scholar ownership and presentation of their data and goals.
Accelerating Learning through High expectations: Conditions for learning will be established, taught, modeled, and monitored in all classrooms. This structure will lead to increased scholars actively engaged in the learning process.
Accelerating Learning through School-wide Literacy: Reading and writing across all content areas with the utilization of core content vocabulary across all subjects. Instruction and scheduling of scholars based on reading screenings provided to all sixth-grade scholars.

Our current level of performance is 27% of our students are proficient on the 2023 FAST Reading and 30% proficiency on 2023 FAST Math. The gap in ELA is occurring because students are not being required to read and write in all content areas. The gap in Math is occurring because data is not being utilized and students are struggling to read and comprehend the content, and unstructured classroom environments.

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

We expect our performance level to increase from 27% to 32% of our black students meeting proficiency by Spring 2024 Progress Monitoring assessment F.A.S.T. in ELA and from 30% to 35% in Math.

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

Bimonthly PLC's, Cycle assessments, formative assessments, walkthroughs, data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which scholars are required to read and write in response to text in a highly organized and engaging classroom setting.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implement Culturally Relevant Teaching (CRT) with fidelity, which engages scholars more effectively in the learning process. It is based on the pedagogy in which every scholar brings specific cultural enhancements to the classroom. As teachers incorporate those cultural strengths into their instruction, scholars will more actively engage in this supportive environment and the problem would be reduced by 15%.

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.

Provide Standards based instruction with necessary scaffolding and/or enrichment.
Analyze data to ensure instruction meets the needs of the scholar.
Ensure culturally responsive classrooms with high expectations, ownership and consistency with expectations and instruction.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Bimonthly PLC common planning. implementing the data, literacy strategies, and support.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

ccelerating Learning through Data-Driven Instruction: Planning benchmark-aligned lessons based on analysis of recent data: both summative and formative. Increase scholar ownership and presentation of their data and goals.
Accelerating Learning through High expectations: Conditions for learning will be established, taught, modeled, and monitored in all classrooms. This structure will lead to increased scholars actively engaged in the learning process.
Accelerating Learning through School-wide Literacy: Reading and writing across all content areas with the utilization of core content vocabulary across all subjects. Instruction and scheduling of scholars based on reading screenings provided to all sixth-grade scholars.

Our current level of performance is 13% of our students are proficient on the 2023 FAST Reading and The gap in ELA is occurring because students are not being required to read and write in all content areas. The gap in Math is occurring because data is not being utilized and students are struggling to read and comprehend the content, and unstructured classroom environments.

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

We expect our performance level to increase from 13% to 18% of our SWD students meeting proficiency by Spring 2024 FAST PM 3.

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

Bimonthly PLC's, Cycle assessments, formative assessments, walkthroughs, data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which scholars are required to read and write in response to text in a highly organized and engaging classroom setting.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If effective implementation of literacy strategies with an emphasis on content specific vocabulary based on formative data would occur, proficiency would increase by 5%.

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.

Provide Standards based instruction with necessary scaffolding and/or enrichment.
Analyze data to ensure instruction meets the needs of the scholar.
Ensure culturally responsive classrooms with high expectations, ownership and consistency with expectations and instruction.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

Bimonthly PLC common planning. implementing data, and literacy strategies into daily activities.

Person Responsible: Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#8. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

Accelerating Learning through Data-Driven Instruction: Planning benchmark-aligned lessons based on analysis of recent data: both summative and formative. Increase scholar ownership and presentation of their data and goals.
Accelerating Learning through High expectations: Conditions for learning will be established, taught, modeled, and monitored in all classrooms. This structure will lead to increased scholars actively engaged in the learning process.
Accelerating Learning through School-wide Literacy: Reading and writing across all content areas with the utilization of core content vocabulary across all subjects. Instruction and scheduling of scholars based on reading screenings provided to all sixth-grade scholars.

Our current level of performance is 27% of our students are proficient on the 2023 FAST Reading and 30% proficiency on 2023 FAST Math. The gap in ELA is occurring because students are not being required to read and write in all content areas. The gap in Math is occurring because data is not being utilized and students are struggling to read and comprehend the content, and unstructured classroom environments.

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

We expect our performance level to increase to 40% of our ELL students meeting proficiency by Spring 2024 Progress Monitoring assessment F.A.S.T. in ELA and 50% in Math.

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

Monitoring will occur through daily walkthroughs, as well as an analysis of data, both formal and informal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Mallory (malloryk@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.)

Enhance staff capacity to identify content from the BEST Benchmarks that will create opportunities for collaboration around higher order thinking questions and allow students to enter a productive struggle and implement Culturally Relevant Teaching with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implement Culturally Relevant Teaching (CRT) with fidelity, which engages scholars more effectively in the learning process. It is based on the pedagogy in which every scholar brings specific cultural enhancements to the classroom. As teachers incorporate those cultural strengths into their instruction, scholars will more actively engage in this supportive environment.

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 meet in PLCs at least twice per month to share ways they are incorporating collaboration into their lessons and what effect placing students in the productive struggle is having on student growth. In PLCs teachers also share ways to support students who continue to struggle with engagement in collaboration around complex tasks.

Person Responsible: Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Administrators monitor and support the implementation of the use of grade appropriate B.E.S.T. complex texts and connected tasks, in reading and ELA classrooms through classroom observation.

Person Responsible: Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards and rigorous performance tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks for Mathematics.

Person Responsible: Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers provide students with at least 1 differentiated learning opportunity within each unit of instruction that addresses either 1) the students' mathematical readiness, 2) the students' interests as related to the mathematics they are learning, and/or 3) the students' choice of how to learn the material (learner profile).

Person Responsible: Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

ELA and reading teachers receive professional development around B.E.S.T. Benchmarks, and collaborative structures.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Place students in the appropriate level ELA class to ensure they are being challenged with the right amount of rigor using the Acceleration Framework (1. Generate Thinking, Purpose, Relevance, and Curiosity, 2. Clearly Articulate the Learning Goal and Expectations, 3. Scaffold and Practice Essential Prerequisite Skills, 4. Introduce New Vocabulary and Review Prior Vocabulary, 5. Dip into the New Concept, and 6. Conduct Formative Assessment Frequently).

Person Responsible: Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

By When: Preschool

iPads will be assigned to Tier A EL scholars to enable them to translate as necessary in their core content classes.

Person Responsible: Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

By When: August 28, 2023

#9. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic

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.

Accelerating Learning through Data-Driven Instruction: Planning benchmark-aligned lessons based on analysis of recent data: both summative and formative. Increase scholar ownership and presentation of their data and goals.
Accelerating Learning through High expectations: Conditions for learning will be established, taught, modeled, and monitored in all classrooms. This structure will lead to increased scholars actively engaged in the learning process.
Accelerating Learning through School-wide Literacy: Reading and writing across all content areas with the utilization of core content vocabulary across all subjects. Instruction and scheduling of scholars based on reading screenings provided to all sixth-grade scholars.

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

We expect our performance level to increase to 40% of our Hispanic scholars meeting proficiency by Spring 2024 Progress Monitoring assessment F.A.S.T. in ELA and 50% in Math.

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

Monitoring will occur through daily walkthroughs, as well as an analysis of data, both formal and informal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Enhance staff capacity to identify content from the BEST Benchmarks that will create opportunities for collaboration around higher order thinking questions and allow students to enter a productive struggle and implement Culturally Relevant Teaching with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implement Culturally Relevant Teaching (CRT) with fidelity, which engages scholars more effectively in the learning process. It is based on the pedagogy in which every scholar brings specific cultural enhancements to the classroom. As teachers incorporate those cultural strengths into their instruction, scholars will more actively engage in this supportive environment.

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 meet in PLCs at least twice per month to share ways they are incorporating collaboration into their lessons and what effect placing students in the productive struggle is having on student growth. In PLCs teachers also share ways to support students who continue to struggle with engagement in collaboration around complex tasks.

Person Responsible: Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Administrators monitor and support the implementation of the use of grade appropriate B.E.S.T. complex texts and connected tasks, in reading and ELA classrooms through classroom observation.

Person Responsible: Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards and rigorous performance tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks for Mathematics.

Person Responsible: Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers provide students with at least 1 differentiated learning opportunity within each unit of instruction that addresses either 1) the students' mathematical readiness, 2) the students' interests as related to the mathematics they are learning, and/or 3) the students' choice of how to learn the material (learner profile).

Person Responsible: Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

ELA and reading teachers receive professional development around B.E.S.T. Benchmarks, and collaborative structures.

Person Responsible: Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Place students in the appropriate level ELA class to ensure they are being challenged with the right amount of rigor using the Acceleration Framework (1. Generate Thinking, Purpose, Relevance, and Curiosity, 2. Clearly Articulate the Learning Goal and Expectations, 3. Scaffold and Practice Essential Prerequisite Skills, 4. Introduce New Vocabulary and Review Prior Vocabulary, 5. Dip into the New Concept, and 6. Conduct Formative Assessment Frequently).

Person Responsible: Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

By When: Preschool

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).

Weekly collaboration, documentation and purchase of needed resources to support our school wide goals. Our Department Heads and instructional coaches will monitor the needs of teachers and scholars, bring the information to the supervising Assistant Principal for approval.