

Pinellas County Schools

Pinellas High Innovation 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Pinellas High Innovation

1220 PALMETTO ST, Clearwater, FL 33755

<http://it.pinellas.k12.fl.us/schools/clearwater-ms>

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.

Educate and prepare students for success in high school through life skills emphasizing hands on activities, use of technology and building positive relationships.

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
Green, Ryan	Principal	<p>The Principal performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, safety, budget, purchasing, public relations, plant operations, food service, and transportation. Position is responsible for the total operational management of the school. Develops, implement, and evaluates school philosophy, goals and objectives reflecting district and state goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops, implements, and evaluates School Improvement Plan (SIP) and School-wide Discipline Plan • Develops and manages a Center of Excellence on the specified campus as approved by the School Board, if applicable • Develops and maintains a positive school/community climate and a safe and healthy environment. • Plans, implements, and evaluates the school instructional program based on student needs and within state and district guidelines • Plans, implements, supervises, and/or evaluates all other programs, i.e., Parent Teacher Association (PTA), School Advisory Committee (SAC), Athletics, Extra-Curricular, Co-Curricular, Booster Clubs, if applicable • Determines staffing needs including selection, supervision, staff development and evaluation of all school personnel • Disseminates and implements Pinellas County School Board policies and procedures as it relates to students staff and school community • Manages finances including the budget and record keeping processes, and inventory control of all school resources • Maintains records and necessary reports for efficient operation of school and compliance with federal, state, and local requirements • Plans and manages for efficient utilization and maintenance of the school plant • Performs other related duties as required
McElveen, Lara	Assistant Principal	<p>MAJOR FUNCTION: This position is second only to the Principal in the administration of the school and serves as liaison between principal and other school personnel.</p> <p>DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: Oversees discipline, Testing, safety and teacher evaluations. Responsible for bringing feedback and input from respective teachers to the leadership team. Provides feedback to teachers concerning best teaching practices. With the team, collaboratively uses data from state and district assessments and reports to help plan and implement professional development for school improvement.</p>

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.

School improvement is a collaborative process with all stakeholders. Families and the community are consulted on a regular basis through our school advisory council and community events. Several parents and community members are regular visitors, providing feedback and ideas for improving school culture, attendance, and ultimately academic performance as this is the priority area of growth. Teachers are part of regular PLC discussions, providing opportunity to develop and adjust our school improvement goals and strategies. Scholars are also part of monthly conversations with our administrative team to discuss success of implemented strategies and approaches to support learning. All of these interactions were part of the steering discussions for the highlighted strategies and goals for our School Improvement Plan.

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 use our vertical alignment strategies to disseminate and receive feedback with our applied strategies. Our school based leadership team will take information and expectations to the PLC teams or SAC and bring back data and suggestions for adjustments to our plan. During our staff meetings we are able to summarize our findings and finalize collaboratively designed adjustments that are needed to enhance our plan effectiveness.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 4-9
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	75%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*

School Grades History	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: UNSATISFACTORY 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: UNSATISFACTORY
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	16	37	67	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	14	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
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	7	27	35	56	125	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	25	30	53	115	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	0	0	0	

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	10	4	13	27	
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	3	21	24	27	105	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	31	34	92	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	15	
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.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	7	13	17	38

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	2	2	5	3	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	7

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	24	27	75	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	31	34	90	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	15	
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.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	7	13	17	37

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	2	2	5	3	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	7

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*	8	63	57	7	70	61
ELA Learning Gains	19	56	55	35	63	59
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	13	42	46	52	56	54
Math Achievement*	8	65	55	5	72	62
Math Learning Gains	35	60	60	28	63	59
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44	51	56	44	54	52
Science Achievement*	5	58	51	2	64	56
Social Studies Achievement*	16	82	72	10	81	78
Middle School Acceleration				4		
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	9			21		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	17
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	157
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	92
Graduation Rate	

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	13	Yes	3	3
ELL	11	Yes	3	3
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	17	Yes	3	3
HSP	10	Yes	3	3
MUL	13	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	32	Yes	3	
FRL	19	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	8	19	13	8	35	44	5	16				9

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
SWD	2	12	14	6	27	38	0	5				
ELL	0	10		5	30							9
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	4	18		7	27	38	4	18				
HSP	3	11		4	27		0	15				9
MUL	10			0	30							
PAC												
WHT	17	32		24	68		20					
FRL	6	19	13	8	35	46	4	17				

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	6	17	36	12	26	27	7	11				63
SWD	4	13	26	11	22	22	9	8				45
ELL	0	4		17	17		0					63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	5	19	44	10	27	22	6	17				
HSP	0	15		15	15		0	8				63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	13	17		13	33		23					
FRL	7	17	35	12	27	25	8	10				54

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	7	35	52	5	28	44	2	10	4			21
SWD	2	36	57	2	37	50	0	0				6
ELL	9	36		7	28		0	17				21
AMI												

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
ASN												
BLK	1	24	47	0	17	22	0	0				
HSP	14	47		10	33		3	15	8			21
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	8	45		9	50		7					
FRL	7	36	52	5	28	40	2	12	4			22

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
05	2023 - Spring	20%	57%	-37%	54%	-34%
07	2023 - Spring	5%	48%	-43%	47%	-42%
08	2023 - Spring	8%	47%	-39%	47%	-39%
09	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	48%	*
06	2023 - Spring	0%	47%	-47%	47%	-47%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	0%	58%	-58%	54%	-54%
07	2023 - Spring	8%	36%	-28%	48%	-40%
08	2023 - Spring	14%	61%	-47%	55%	-41%
05	2023 - Spring	30%	61%	-31%	55%	-25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	6%	47%	-41%	44%	-38%
05	2023 - Spring	*	60%	*	51%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	12%	68%	-56%	66%	-54%

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.

ELA and Math proficiency levels. Contributing factor(s): Level of instruction did not consistently meet the grade level rigor of testing. Classroom culture and expectations were not consistent across all grade level classrooms.

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

No data on growth available. Both Math and ELA numbers reflecting proficiency were very low and need to have specific strategies for increasing both growth and proficiency.

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.

ELA and Math proficiency levels. Contributing factor(s): Level of instruction did not consistently meet the grade level rigor of testing. Classroom culture and expectations were not consistent across all grade level classrooms.

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

Our grade 5 scholars showed consistent performance. Our 5th grade class used small group learning consistently and remediation based on assessments.

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

There is a significant gap between the high success rate of passing classes and the low success rate of proficiency on the state assessments.

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

Individualized instruction through small group learning

Classroom culture of high expectations for academics and behavior

Grade-level instruction that mirrors the rigor of content area state assessments

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 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.

Our goal is to improve both Scholar and Staff attendance by 10%. This goal will also include retaining all staff from lateral movement (moving in-county to an equivalent position).

Our school was dependent on several long-term subs and daily subs for the 22-23 school year. This inconsistency created problems with supporting learners academically and with building culture.

Scholar attendance problems highly effected success on the state exams. 46% of our scholars missed more than 10% of their assigned school days.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Reduce our 10% or more absence list of scholars from 46% to 20%.

Monitoring:

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

Through our CST, we will examine progress bi-weekly to address any scholar absences that are extended or unexcused. Our team will provide differentiated and personalized intervention for families with scholars struggling with attendance.

Staff retention and connection will be monitored through quarterly survey and reflection.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Green (greenry@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.)

1. Along with PBIS, PHI will implement has components: 1) publicize the importance of attendance; 2) establish attendance goals and acknowledge improvements; 3) provide an informal and formal focus on attendance; 4) communicate with parents and provide ways for parents to engage with the school; and 5) use motivation systems to generate enthusiasm. (Similar to(ATI-UP), but focusing on PBIS)

2.Herman, R., Dawson, P., Dee, T., Greene, J., Maynard, R., Redding, S., and Darwin, M. (2008). Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools: A practice guide (NCEE #2008-4020). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides>.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. . Research demonstrates improved attendance through connectedness and intentional, consistent supports that work through our PBIS systems and are implemented systematically and with fidelity. Increased success with scholars will increase the connectedness of staff.

2. This practice guide addressing turnaround of chronically low-performing schools recommends that strong leadership signal the need for dramatic change. It is important that principals “demonstrate commitment to developing a learning community for students and staff with the primary focus of the school on learning with staff and students working together toward that goal” (pg. 10). School leaders also signal change through clear communication, creating high expectations, sharing leadership and authority, demonstrating a willingness to make

the same types of changes asked of their staff, identifying advocates with the staff, building a consensus that permeates the staff, ensuring that the maximum amount of classroom time is focused on instruction and establishing a cohesive culture.

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.

School-wide Implementation of PBIS including increased communication to families and opportunities for families to engage with our school.

Person Responsible: Ryan Green (greenry@pcsb.org)

By When: Implementation will begin day 1 of school. Full plan for the school year will be developed by November.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**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.

Scholars are coming to PHI with a great variance of experience and ability. Many learners are needing remedial support to provide the scaffolding needed to be successful on grade level instructional tasks. Over 90% of our scholars have been identified as level 1 in reading and mathematics.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Growth on the FAST assessment for 50% of all learners in Math and ELA.

Monitoring:

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

FAST PM 1 and 2

Content areas common assessments

100% implementation of small group remediation/teaching in all core classrooms by October observed through classroom walk-throughs.

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.)

1. Small group intervention will be used in all core content areas to improve differentiated and specific instruction. Researchers in Canada found that elementary and middle-school students in foster-care who were assigned to small-group tutoring improved their standardized test scores in math and the reading skills of decoding and spelling, although there were not significant effects on reading comprehension (Harper & Schmidt, 2016). Small group work will be connected to high engagement activities that reinforce learning, including field trips relating to ELA and STEM instruction.

2. Herman, R., Dawson, P., Dee, T., Greene, J., Maynard, R., Redding, S., and Darwin, M. (2008). Turning

Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools: A practice guide (NCEE #2008-4020). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. A large meta-analysis examining effective academic interventions for low-income children in OECD and EU countries also determined that group tutoring had a positive association with improving student achievement (Dietrichson et al., 2017)

2. The practice guide states that a “comprehensive curriculum review can ensure that the curriculum aligns with state and local standards and meets the needs of all students. In addition, the What Works Clearinghouse establishes levels of evidence for assessing the quality of evidence supporting educational programs and practices. The practice guide also indicates that schools need to “examine student achievement data to identify gaps and weaknesses in student learning....they can examine student learning through standards-based assessments and classroom assessments”.

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 professional development on small group learning and implementation of small group learning.

Monitored through data collection by administrative walk throughs. Reviewed in content area PLC time and SBLT.

After implementation is monitored, level of practice will be evaluated through scholar evidence of learning in PLCs. Review will be focused on writing samples about reading in all content areas.

Focus will be connected to instruction including on grade level learning expectations. Many of our scholars require scaffolding to build the skills to meet the rigor of grade level expectations. The learning and work review will be focused on the end goal of rigorous, on grade level learning expectations.

Person Responsible: Ryan Green (greenry@pcsb.org)

By When: October 2023 - small group instruction. January 2024 - scholar evidence of thinking via writing in all content areas.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**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.

Our primary goal is to meet the individual and group needs of our scholars based on their academic and behavioral histories. Our effectiveness in the venture is highly dependent on a collaborative approach to support. The collaboration will focus on the continued high expectations of teaching on grade level material to scholars who are, many, performing below grade level in core classes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Growth on the FAST assessment for 50% of all learners in Math and ELA.

Monitoring:

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

FAST PM 1 and 2

Content areas common assessments

100% implementation of small group remediation/teaching in all core classrooms by October observed through classroom walk-throughs.

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.)

1. PLC work will be implemented to support cultural and instructional needs.

PLCs provide an environment that encourages professional development, collaboration and innovation among

teachers. Research suggests positive school reform occurs when teachers participate in authentic PLCs, with improved student achievement as a by-product (Wilson, 2016).

2. Herman, R., Dawson, P., Dee, T., Greene, J., Maynard, R., Redding, S., and Darwin, M. (2008). Turning

Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools: A practice guide (NCEE #2008-4020). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Professional learning communities, when successfully instituted by school leaders and embraced by participants, have been shown to improve student achievement as well as teacher perception.

2. The practice guide reflects that schools in need of improvement should “monitor progress and make adjustments”. Once schools have identified areas that needed improvement and develop a plan to improve instruction, they should continually monitor progress. In the schools cited in the practice guide, all of them used benchmark assessments or in some way systematically monitored student achievement and progress toward instructional goals. This was done so instruction could be modified as needed.

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 professional development focused on small group instruction, movement in learning, and writing about reading.

Person Responsible: Ryan Green (greenry@pcsb.org)

By When: Small group and movement in learning - October 2023 Writing about Reading - January 2024 Administration will monitor implementation through walkthrough data and PLC work. Student work will be reviewed in PLC meetings. Collaboration and accountability will drive our discussions on Student evidence to evaluate on grade level rigor and expectations in student work.

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)).

Our school has placed high value on building instructor skill, collaboration, growth, and fidelity of instruction. We have chosen to highlight growing our building culture through engagement activities both inside and outside of the classroom. We have provided opportunities in the classroom for hands-on learning and outside the classroom with teacher training and engaging scholars with supplementary learning and support opportunities.

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

We use a variety of ways to communicate with our community and families. The SIP will be posted on our website: <https://www.pcsb.org/clearwater-ms>. Weekly emails and callouts are provided to stakeholders to keep updated on school functions, goals, and expectations. SIP connections are made

during these regular communications. Several family nights happen throughout the year as well to communicate our titel I and SIP goals as well as progress on goals therein.

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))

Weekly emails and callouts are provided to stakeholders to keep updated on school functions, goals, and expectations. SIP connections are made during these regular communications. Several family nights happen throughout the year as well to communicate our titel I and SIP goals as well as progress on goals therein. Instructional leaders also make frequent family calls and emails to connect with the families of their scholars. This allows families to be involved with academic an behavioral progress and supports.

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)

We are focusing on small group learning to differentiate teaching provide individualized learning and remediation. We are also investing in building capacity with our instructional staff with weekly content are PLC work to examine student work that will be reviewed in perspective to planned grade-level learning objectives. This ongoing reflection and accountability will ensure high level instruction and learning.

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))

All programs are aligned in accordance to national and state expectations and regulations.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$33,876.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	510	3341 - Pinellas High Innovation	UniSIG		\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/supplies: To support and expand our PBIS program, the school will include active and engaging learning. This includes creating learning opportunities that allows students to use active opportunities to reinforce learning. Learners process information best when they are physically engaged during the learning process; they often prefer a learning through doing approach. Additional PBIS activities will include semester incentives such as participation in field day. This activity includes purchasing the equipment and supplies needed to host the field day events.</i>			
	6400	330	3341 - Pinellas High Innovation	UniSIG		\$31,376.00

			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/travel: The school would like to send two administrators and two instructional leaders to the Harvard School Turnaround Leaders Conference. This conference is normally held in June in Cambridge, MA. The four 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 Pinellas High Innovation. During the conference, our staff will work as a team and the engagement experienced by this core leadership team is critical for the school to transform. The school objectives 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. Estimated costs for each attendee: Registration \$3995, airfare \$3,492 (\$873 x 4), lodging 4,584 (\$382/night x 6 nights x 4 rooms), meals \$1,536 (\$64/day x 6 days x 4), mileage/parking/ride shares \$300 = \$7,844. 00 per attendee. Estimated costs for four attendees = \$31,376.</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				\$13,034.25
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	510	3341 - Pinellas High Innovation	UniSIG		\$4,439.25
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/supplies: Classroom supplies consisting of items such as additional copies of materials so items can be specific to the needs of the learners. Instructional materials may be required to be translated into students' native language or enlarged print may be needed. This also includes skeleton notes for teachers to use. Supplies may also include manipulatives for hands on learning, notebooks for notes, binders for organization, general materials for everyday participation in lessons (pens pencils paper).</i>			
	5100	510	3341 - Pinellas High Innovation	UniSIG		\$4,000.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/supplies: Flexible seating (bean bags, fidgets, etc.): Our focus is to use small group learning across all content areas. Flexible seating will be utilized within small group learning and restorative circle times. This will allow classes to build a culture of choice and engagement with a focus of on grade-level personalized instruction.</i>			
	5100	330	3341 - Pinellas High Innovation	UniSIG		\$2,195.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/travel: Scholars will attend field trips to see content in real life including plays related to ELA instruction and the aquarium to engage and grow competence in STEM related learning. This student experience will help students by seeing literary works and Science/math in person. Play options are offered at the Tampa, Florida Straz theater. STEM activities are offered at the Florida Clearwater Marine Aquarium. We estimate approximately 100 tickets will be needed per field trip. Estimated admission costs for Straz performances = \$1,200 (\$12 x 100) and for the Aquarium \$995 (\$9.95 x 100). Field trip days will be grouped by grade levels. Transportation costs are a separate budget line.</i>			
	7800	390	3341 - Pinellas High Innovation	UniSIG		\$2,400.00
			<i>Notes: Student transportation services/other purchased services: Estimated costs for Straz performance in Tampa = \$1,200 (\$600/bus x 2 buses) and for Aquarium = \$1,200 (\$600/bus x 2 buses)</i>			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				\$21,276.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6300	120	3341 - Pinellas High Innovation	UniSIG		\$2,440.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction curriculum development services/classroom teachers: We encourage our teachers to work together to evaluate, critique and build lessons that will maximize high yield outcomes through consistent on grade level instruction. - this is a separate activity and paid at \$20 per hour - collaborative planning + fringe \$22.50/hour x 240 hours = \$5,400.</i>			

	6400	330	3341 - Pinellas High Innovation	UniSIG		\$15,325.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/travel: Innovative Schools Summit (PBIS, Discipline, Trauma impacted students) in Nashville, TN (6/19-23/24). Estimated costs for each attendee: Registration \$545, airfare \$500, lodging \$1,375 (\$275/night x 5 nights), meals \$320 (\$64/day x 5 days), mileage/parking \$325 = \$3,065 per attendee. Estimated costs for five attendees = \$15,325. Florida</i>			
	6300	210	3341 - Pinellas High Innovation	UniSIG		\$326.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction curriculum development services/retirement: Collaborative planning retirement contribution (13.57%)</i>			
	6300	220	3341 - Pinellas High Innovation	UniSIG		\$184.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction curriculum development services/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Collaborative planning FICA taxes (7.65%).</i>			
	6400	120	3341 - Pinellas High Innovation	UniSIG		\$2,475.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/classroom teachers: We also encourage our teachers to attend professional development outside of the school day to increase their knowledge in instructional practices. Stipends for these activities are paid at \$22.50/hour x 110 hours = \$2,475.</i>			
	6400	210	3341 - Pinellas High Innovation	UniSIG		\$336.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/retirement: Stipend teachers retirement contribution (13.57%)</i>			
	6400	220	3341 - Pinellas High Innovation	UniSIG		\$190.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Stipend teachers FICA taxes (7.65%).</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