

Pinellas County Schools

East Lake High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 40 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

East Lake High School

1300 SILVER EAGLE DR, Tarpon Springs, FL 34688

<http://www.eastlake-hs.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.

The community of East Lake High School will develop productive and responsible students who are prepared for post-secondary education, the workforce, and citizenship.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Schmittdiel, Daniel | Principal | |
| Godwin, Chiquita | Assistant Principal | |
| Anderson, Shawn | Assistant Principal | |
| Latimore, Dwight | Assistant Principal | |
| Hatfield, Megan | Assistant 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.

Stakeholder feedback was taken into account via multiple methods throughout the school year to help drive the 2023-24 SIP. For students, this includes the school climate survey at the end of semester 1, student body survey feedback via Microsoft Forms in April 2023, and input from student leadership throughout semester 2. Parents provided feedback in the school climate survey, along with feedback from the School Advisory Council (SAC) that will occur again prior to the start of the 2023-24 school year to get final input and approval from the SAC team.

Staff feedback via whole staff surveys and small group discussions with teacher leaders (along with the Administrative Team) helped drive the big rocks and action steps for the school year. Final department feedback was also provided during pre-school to help finalize the SIP prior to the start of the school year regarding commitment to each department specific action step, centered around our big rocks.

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))

Our big rocks and action steps will be embedded into our daily work, aligned with all meetings (i.e. faculty and department meetings, PLCs, SBLT, Administrative Team Meetings, etc.) and reviewed multiple times a month with various leadership groups to determine next steps. Classroom walkthroughs will be utilized daily to help determine whether the action steps need to be adjusted globally or specific teacher supports are needed. This plan is fluid, so we will make adjustments as needed based on the data and collaboration with school-based leaders and stakeholder feedback.

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School PK, 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 28% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 25% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Identification | N/A |
| 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 769 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 312 |
| 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 | |

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 | 461 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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* | 66 | 51 | 52 | 69 | 56 | 56 |
| ELA Learning Gains | 58 | 49 | 52 | 55 | 51 | 51 |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 52 | 41 | 41 | 46 | 43 | 42 |
| Math Achievement* | 56 | 41 | 41 | 61 | 45 | 51 |
| Math Learning Gains | 48 | 47 | 48 | 58 | 44 | 48 |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 50 | 46 | 49 | 42 | 41 | 45 |
| Science Achievement* | 82 | 61 | 61 | 79 | 64 | 68 |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 87 | 69 | 68 | 86 | 71 | 73 |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 100 | | | 100 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 74 | | | 74 | | |
| ELP Progress | 77 | | | 58 | | |

** 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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 68 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 750 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Graduation Rate

100

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| SWD | 51 | | | |
| ELL | 60 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 87 | | | |
| BLK | 51 | | | |
| HSP | 64 | | | |
| MUL | 68 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | | | |
| FRL | 59 | | | |

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 | 66 | 58 | 52 | 56 | 48 | 50 | 82 | 87 | | 100 | 74 | 77 |
| SWD | 33 | 56 | 49 | 47 | 50 | 40 | 42 | 63 | | 100 | 33 | |
| ELL | 33 | 65 | 71 | 46 | 43 | | 53 | 77 | | 100 | 32 | 77 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 89 | 71 | | 82 | 91 | | 91 | 100 | | 100 | 75 | |
| BLK | 38 | 39 | 20 | 25 | 38 | 50 | 57 | 76 | | 100 | 62 | |
| HSP | 55 | 57 | 60 | 46 | 45 | 38 | 75 | 85 | | 100 | 60 | 79 |
| MUL | 65 | 51 | 40 | 59 | 50 | | 86 | 88 | | 100 | 71 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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 |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| WHT | 69 | 59 | 54 | 59 | 48 | 54 | 84 | 88 | | 100 | 76 | 77 |
| FRL | 51 | 54 | 45 | 45 | 38 | 50 | 70 | 76 | | 100 | 61 | 56 |

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 | 65 | 55 | 43 | 44 | 34 | 28 | 76 | 83 | | 100 | 69 | 73 |
| SWD | 33 | 35 | 23 | 36 | 40 | 30 | 55 | 68 | | 100 | 33 | |
| ELL | 33 | 43 | 34 | 29 | 56 | 70 | 46 | 33 | | 100 | 53 | 73 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 82 | 51 | | 38 | 54 | | 92 | 83 | | 100 | 79 | |
| BLK | 38 | 51 | 45 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 62 | 56 | | 100 | 65 | |
| HSP | 60 | 58 | 39 | 39 | 38 | 38 | 62 | 78 | | 100 | 61 | 57 |
| MUL | 70 | 61 | 40 | 61 | 39 | | 79 | 91 | | 100 | 67 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 54 | 43 | 47 | 34 | 24 | 79 | 85 | | 100 | 70 | |
| FRL | 51 | 52 | 42 | 34 | 36 | 33 | 61 | 72 | | 99 | 56 | 71 |

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 | 69 | 55 | 46 | 61 | 58 | 42 | 79 | 86 | | 100 | 74 | 58 |
| SWD | 38 | 41 | 40 | 41 | 44 | 26 | 40 | 53 | | 100 | 41 | |
| ELL | 27 | 48 | 52 | 32 | 67 | 60 | 62 | 45 | | 100 | 64 | 58 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | 54 | | 74 | 76 | | 91 | 73 | | 100 | 75 | |
| BLK | 51 | 54 | 38 | 34 | 44 | | 62 | 71 | | 100 | 33 | |
| HSP | 56 | 51 | 47 | 54 | 56 | 33 | 69 | 75 | | 100 | 72 | 56 |
| MUL | 84 | 61 | | 78 | 73 | | 95 | 88 | | 100 | 83 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 55 | 45 | 63 | 58 | 43 | 80 | 89 | | 100 | 76 | |
| FRL | 58 | 52 | 46 | 51 | 50 | 36 | 67 | 72 | | 98 | 61 | 65 |

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 |
| 10 | 2023 - Spring | 65% | 48% | 17% | 50% | 15% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 63% | 46% | 17% | 48% | 15% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 53% | -15% | 50% | -12% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 62% | 46% | 16% | 48% | 14% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 82% | 59% | 23% | 63% | 19% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 84% | 59% | 25% | 63% | 21% |

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.

The data component that showed the lowest proficiency at 53% was our math achievement from both the Algebra 1 EOC and Geometry EOC. Some contributing factors include a need to utilize common assessments in PLCs to drive instruction and plan for consistent differentiation and ongoing remediation when necessary throughout the year. Additionally, we will focus on cognitively complex tasks and student-centered instruction in the classroom to assist our students to dig deeper and take ownership of their learning. We are also working to ensure that students are placed in appropriate courses based on their individual data and needs for the 2023-24 school year, which will also have a positive impact.

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

Our math achievement was the area with the greatest decline, with a decrease of 3% from 56% to 53% on the Algebra 1 and Geometry EOCs. Some contributing factors include a need to utilize common assessments in PLCs to drive instruction and plan for consistent differentiation and ongoing remediation when necessary throughout the year. Additionally, we will focus on cognitively complex tasks and student-centered instruction in the classroom to assist our students to dig deeper and take ownership of their learning. We are also working to ensure that students are placed in appropriate courses based on their individual data and needs for the 2023-24 school year, which will also have a positive impact.

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.

Achievement for both our Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners is one of our greatest need for improvement, as evidenced by the FAST PM3 ELA assessment data. An increased focus on relational capacity and tailoring instruction to the needs of each student (i.e. Specially Designed Instruction and focus on Can-Do-Descriptors), along with cognitively complex tasks and student-centered instruction in the classroom will assist in meeting the needs of our learners and work to eliminate the gap.

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

With new standards during the 2022-23 school year, our ELA achievement level showed the most improvement from last year, as compared to schools within the county. This can be contributed to collaborative planning, data driving instructional practice (both formative classroom data and utilization of Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 data to drive instruction), and ongoing professional development for the department. This will continue during the 2023-24 school year with a focus on cognitively complex tasks and student-centered instruction.

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

Achievement for both our Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners is one of our greatest need for improvement, as evidenced by the FAST PM3 ELA assessment data. An increased focus on relational capacity and tailoring instruction to the needs of each student (i.e. Specially Designed Instruction and focus on Can-Do-Descriptors), along with cognitively complex tasks and student-centered instruction in the classroom will assist in meeting the needs of our learners and work to eliminate the gap.

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

1. Math Proficiency
2. Math Learning Gains
3. ELA Proficiency

4. ELA Learning Gains
5. Subgroup Achievement Gap

Area of Focus

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

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

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

Our current level of performance is 65%, as evidenced by the 2023 FAST PM3 ELA assessment. Our continued growth will be addressed by focusing on student-centered instruction and engagement, cognitively complex tasks through WICOR, and maximizing instructional time each day. With this focus, there will be a student increase of 8% or more.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 65% to 73%, with L25 learning gains of at least 55%, as measured by the FAST PM 3 ELA assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored throughout the school year with classroom walkthroughs and actionable feedback, along with active participation in Data Driven PLCs, to ensure that data drives daily instructional practices. We will also analyze cycle assessment data via Data Driven PLCs to address global (and individualized) areas of need to develop ongoing remediation and spiraled instruction plans as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in complex tasks.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize questions at the appropriate complexity to help students elaborate and work toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in Focused Note Taking (FNT) to ensure that students effectively process, connect, reflect, and apply their notes and learning, assisting in progression toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize formative assessment strategies throughout each class period to monitor student progress toward mastery of the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing ongoing professional development opportunities surrounding student-centered instruction and engagement and cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Note-Taking and collaboration strategies), teachers will continue to strengthen their pedagogical practices, which will result in ALL students engaging in rigorous tasks in the classroom at an appropriate cognitive level.

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.

1. Teachers engage in district led professional learning opportunities and district core specific PLCs, along with collaborating with district Staff Developers at the school throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

2. Teachers engage in pre-school and ongoing professional development, along with intentionally planning to engage students in cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Note Taking and collaborative strategies) and student-centered instruction. Teachers will also write into lesson plans and ask Higher Order Thinking Questions to engage students in thinking, discussing, and/or writing responses, along with utilizing each of the phases of AVID Focused Note Taking when writing to learn in all content areas.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

3. Teachers will engage students in reading and analyzing complex B.E.S.T. texts and utilize reading protocols and anchor charts to help make sense of the different texts and support learning.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

4. Teachers utilize daily formative assessment strategies to check for understanding, using that data to gauge student progress toward mastery of the standard, centered around both classroom formative and summative assessments and course specific available resources (i.e. Albert.io, AP Classroom, Marco Learning, PLC created common assessments and questions). Teachers utilize the formative assessment data to drive instructional practices both in the moment and for future lessons.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

5. Teachers and administrative team engage in Data Driven PLCs to analyze common assessment data (formative and summative), to drive instructional practices within the classroom. Data is utilized to determine remediation and extension needs to meet the diverse needs of our learners. Teachers also support students with data chats surrounding B.E.S.T. standards where students are guided to standards-based resources for reteaching, followed by reassessment to proficiency of benchmarks to determine next steps.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

6. Administrative team conducts walkthroughs to provide actionable feedback surrounding strategies tied to our school-wide priorities.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

7. Teachers and administrative team collaborate in Strategy Walks with a structured debrief/planning session via Teacher Demonstration Days at least one time per quarter, centered around our school-wide priorities. Teachers will implement their learning with actionable feedback from the administrative team walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

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

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

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

Our current level of performance is 53%, as evidenced by the 2023 Algebra 1 and Geometry EOCs. Our continued growth will be addressed by focusing on student-centered instruction and engagement, cognitively complex tasks through WICOR, and maximizing instructional time each day. With this focus, there will be a student increase of 8% or more.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all students achieving math proficiency will increase from 53% to 61%, with L25 learning gains of at least 55%, as measured by the Algebra 1 and Geometry EOCs.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored throughout the school year with classroom walkthroughs and actionable feedback, along with active participation in Data Driven PLCs, to ensure that data drives daily instructional practices. We will also analyze cycle assessment data via Data Driven PLCs to address global (and individualized) areas of need to develop ongoing remediation and spiraled instruction plans as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dwight Latimore (latimoredw@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in complex tasks.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize questions at the appropriate complexity to help students elaborate and work toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in Focused Note Taking (FNT) to ensure that students effectively process, connect, reflect, and apply their notes and learning, assisting in progression toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize formative assessment strategies throughout each class period to monitor student progress toward mastery of the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing ongoing professional development opportunities surrounding student-centered instruction and engagement and cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Notetaking and collaboration strategies), teachers will continue to strengthen their pedagogical practices, which will result in ALL students engaging in rigorous tasks in the classroom at an appropriate cognitive level.

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.

1. Teachers engage in district led professional learning opportunities and district core specific PLCs, along with collaborating with district Staff Developers at the school throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Dwight Latimore (latimoredw@pcsb.org)

By When:

2. Teachers engage in pre-school and ongoing professional development, along with intentionally planning to engage students in cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Note Taking and collaborative strategies) and student-centered instruction. Teachers will also write into lesson plans and ask Higher Order Thinking Questions to engage students in thinking, discussing, and/or writing responses, along with utilizing each of the phases of AVID Focused Note Taking when writing to learn in all content areas.

Person Responsible: Dwight Latimore (latimoredw@pcsb.org)

By When:

3. Teachers will utilize approved calculators and testing reference sheets (Algebra 1 and Geometry) daily, as aligned to B.E.S.T. testing, to support student learning.

Person Responsible: Dwight Latimore (latimoredw@pcsb.org)

By When:

4. Teachers utilize daily formative assessment strategies to check for understanding, using that data to gauge student progress toward mastery of the standard, centered around both classroom formative and summative assessments and course specific available resources (i.e. Albert.io, IXL, B.E.S.T. benchmark-based formative assessments and common assessments, PLC created common assessments and questions). Teachers utilize the formative assessment data to progress monitor and drive instructional practices both in the moment and for future lessons.

Person Responsible: Dwight Latimore (latimoredw@pcsb.org)

By When:

5. Teachers and administrative team engage in Data Driven PLCs to analyze common assessment data (formative and summative), to drive instructional practices within the classroom. Data is utilized to determine remediation and extension needs to meet the diverse needs of our learners. Teachers also support students with data chats surrounding B.E.S.T. standards where students are guided to standards-based resources for reteaching, followed by reassessment to proficiency of benchmarks to determine next steps.

Person Responsible: Dwight Latimore (latimoredw@pcsb.org)

By When:

6. During PLCs, teachers and administrative team collaboratively plan utilizing resources including the Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards BLUE benchmark book, district planning documents, and textbook resources to support student learning.

Person Responsible: Dwight Latimore (latimoredw@pcsb.org)

By When:

7. Administrative team conducts walkthroughs to provide actionable feedback surrounding strategies tied to our school-wide priorities.

Person Responsible: Dwight Latimore (latimoredw@pcsb.org)

By When:

8. Teachers and administrative team collaborate in Strategy Walks with a structured debrief/planning session via Teacher Demonstration Days at least one time per quarter, centered around our school-wide priorities. Teachers will implement their learning with actionable feedback from the administrative team walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Dwight Latimore (latimoredw@pcsb.org)

By When:

#3. 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.

Our current level of performance is 82%, as evidenced by the Biology EOC. Our continued growth will be addressed by focusing on student-centered instruction and engagement, cognitively complex tasks through WICOR, and maximizing instructional time each day. With this focus, there will be a student increase of 8% or more.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all students achieving Biology 1 EOC proficiency will increase from 82% to 90%, as measured by the Biology 1 EOC.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored throughout the school year with classroom walkthroughs and actionable feedback, along with active participation in Data Driven PLCs, to ensure that data drives daily instructional practices. We will also analyze cycle assessment data via Data Driven PLCs to address global (and individualized) areas of need to develop ongoing remediation and spiraled instruction plans as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shawn Anderson (andersonshaw@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in complex tasks.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize questions at the appropriate complexity to help students elaborate and work toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in Focused Note Taking (FNT) to ensure that students effectively process, connect, reflect, and apply their notes and learning, assisting in progression toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize formative assessment strategies throughout each class period to monitor student progress toward mastery of the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing ongoing professional development opportunities surrounding student-centered instruction and engagement and cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Notetaking and collaboration strategies), teachers will continue to strengthen their pedagogical practices, which will result in ALL students engaging in rigorous tasks in the classroom at an appropriate cognitive level.

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.

1. Teachers engage in district led professional learning opportunities and district core specific PLCs, along with collaborating with district Staff Developers at the school throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Shawn Anderson (andersonshaw@pcsb.org)

By When:

2. Teachers engage in pre-school and ongoing professional development, along with intentionally planning to engage students in cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Note Taking and collaborative strategies) and student-centered instruction. Teachers will also write into lesson plans and ask Higher Order Thinking Questions to engage students in thinking, discussing, and/or writing responses, along with utilizing each of the phases of AVID Focused Note Taking when writing to learn in all content areas.

Person Responsible: Shawn Anderson (andersonshaw@pcsb.org)

By When:

3. Teachers utilize daily formative assessment strategies to check for understanding, using that data to gauge student progress toward mastery of the standard, centered around both classroom formative and summative assessments and course specific available resources. Teachers utilize the formative assessment data to drive instructional practices both in the moment and for future lessons.

Person Responsible: Shawn Anderson (andersonshaw@pcsb.org)

By When:

4. Teachers and administrative team engage in Data Driven PLCs to analyze common assessment data (formative and summative), to drive instructional practices within the classroom. Data is utilized to determine remediation and extension needs to meet the diverse needs of our learners. Teachers also support students with data chats where students are guided to standards-based resources for reteaching followed by reassessment to determine next steps.

Person Responsible: Shawn Anderson (andersonshaw@pcsb.org)

By When:

5. Administrative team conducts walkthroughs to provide actionable feedback surrounding strategies tied to our school-wide priorities.

Person Responsible: Shawn Anderson (andersonshaw@pcsb.org)

By When:

6. Teachers and administrative team collaborate in Strategy Walks with a structured debrief/planning session via Teacher Demonstration Days at least one time per quarter, centered around our school-wide priorities. Teachers will implement their learning with actionable feedback from the administrative team walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Shawn Anderson (andersonshaw@pcsb.org)

By When:

#4. 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.

Our current level of performance is 84%, as evidenced by the US History EOC. Our continued growth will be addressed by focusing on student-centered instruction and engagement, cognitively complex tasks through WICOR, and maximizing instructional time each day. With this focus, there will be a student increase of 8% or more.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all students achieving US History EOC proficiency will increase from 84% to 92%, as measured by the US History EOC.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored throughout the school year with classroom walkthroughs and actionable feedback, along with active participation in Data Driven PLCs, to ensure that data drives daily instructional practices. We will also analyze cycle assessment data via Data Driven PLCs to address global (and individualized) areas of need to develop ongoing remediation and spiraled instruction plans as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in complex tasks.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize questions at the appropriate complexity to help students elaborate and work toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in Focused Note Taking (FNT) to ensure that students effectively process, connect, reflect, and apply their notes and learning, assisting in progression toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize formative assessment strategies throughout each class period to monitor student progress toward mastery of the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing ongoing professional development opportunities surrounding student-centered instruction and engagement and cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Notetaking and collaboration strategies), teachers will continue to strengthen their pedagogical practices, which will result in ALL students engaging in rigorous tasks in the classroom at an appropriate cognitive level.

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.

1. Teachers engage in district led professional learning opportunities and district core specific PLCs, along with collaborating with district Staff Developers at the school throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

2. Teachers engage in pre-school and ongoing professional development, along with intentionally planning to engage students in cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Note Taking and collaborative strategies) and student-centered instruction. Teachers will also write into lesson plans and ask Higher Order Thinking Questions to engage students in thinking, discussing, and/or writing responses, along with utilizing each of the phases of AVID Focused Note Taking when writing to learn in all content areas.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

3. Teachers utilize daily formative assessment strategies to check for understanding, using that data to gauge student progress toward mastery of the standard, centered around both classroom formative and summative assessments and course specific available resources (i.e. Albert.io, AP Classroom, Marco Learning, PLC created common assessments and questions). Teachers utilize the formative assessment data to drive instructional practices both in the moment and for future lessons.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

4. Teachers and administrative team engage in Data Driven PLCs to analyze common assessment data (formative and summative), to drive instructional practices within the classroom. Data is utilized to determine remediation and extension needs to meet the diverse needs of our learners. Teachers also support students with benchmark chats where students are guided to standards-based resources for reteaching followed by reassessment to determine next steps.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

5. Administrative team conducts walkthroughs to provide actionable feedback surrounding strategies tied to our school-wide priorities and benchmark expectations.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

6. Teachers and administrative team collaborate in Strategy Walks with a structured debrief/planning session via Teacher Demonstration Days at least one time per quarter, centered around our school-wide priorities. Teachers will implement their learning with actionable feedback from the administrative team walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education**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 current level of performance is 72%, as evidenced by the 2022 graduating class data. Our continued growth will be addressed by focusing on student-centered instruction and engagement, cognitively complex tasks through WICOR, and maximizing instructional time each day., along with a continued focus on increasing enrollment and supports for students in Advanced Placement, Dual Enrollment, and CTAE courses on and off campus for equitable learning opportunities for ALL students. With this focus, there will be a student increase of 8% or more.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of students enrolled in and achieving in College and Career Coursework (i.e. AP, DE, and CTAE) will increase by 8%, from 72% to 80%, as measured by consistent use of formative assessment throughout the year, AP/DE/Industry Certification assessments, and the acceleration school grade calculation for the class of 2024.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored via both enrollment numbers and student resiliency through leadership team meetings, classroom walkthroughs with actionable feedback, participation in Data Driven PLCs to determine next steps, and a systematic approach to course promotion centered around student interest and potential for future cohorts.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Schmittiel (schmittield@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in complex tasks.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize questions at the appropriate complexity to help students elaborate and work toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in Focused Note Taking (FNT) to ensure that they effectively process, connect, reflect, and apply their notes and learning, assisting in progression toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize formative assessment strategies throughout each class period to monitor student progress toward mastery of the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing ongoing professional development opportunities surrounding student-centered instruction and engagement and cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Notetaking and collaboration strategies), teachers will continue to strengthen their pedagogical practices, which will result in ALL students engaging in rigorous tasks in the classroom at an appropriate cognitive level.

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.

1. Progress monitor students' progression toward College and Career Readiness, measured by their success in AP, DE, CTAE, and/or AVID coursework in leadership meetings.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmittiel (schmittiel@pcsb.org)

By When:

2. Teachers engage in district led professional learning opportunities, including participating in district AP and CTAE PLCs.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmittiel (schmittiel@pcsb.org)

By When:

3. Teachers engage in pre-school and ongoing professional development in and implement strategies surrounding student-centered instruction and engagement, cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Note-Taking and collaboration strategies) to support learning for ALL students equitably.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmittiel (schmittiel@pcsb.org)

By When:

4. Teachers utilize daily formative assessment strategies to check for understanding, using that data to gauge student progress toward mastery of the standard, centered around both classroom formative and summative assessments and course specific available resources (i.e. Albert.io, IXL, AP Classroom, Marco Learning). Teachers utilize the formative assessment data to drive instructional practices both in the moment and for future lessons and provide students opportunities to take ownership of their data.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmittiel (schmittiel@pcsb.org)

By When:

5. Teachers intentionally plan lessons, supported by district resources when applicable, to engage students in cognitively complex tasks through various WICOR strategies (i.e. Focused Note-Taking and collaborative strategies), to provide rigorous learning opportunities within the classroom each day.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmittiel (schmittiel@pcsb.org)

By When:

6. Teachers and administrative team engage in Data Driven PLCs to analyze common assessment data (formative and summative), to drive instructional practices within the classroom. Data is utilized to determine remediation and extension needs to meet the diverse needs of our learners.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmittiel (schmittiel@pcsb.org)

By When:

7. Administrative team conducts walkthroughs to provide actionable feedback surrounding strategies tied to our school-wide priorities.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmittiel (schmittiel@pcsb.org)

By When:

8. Teachers and administrative team collaborate in Strategy Walks with a structured debrief/planning session via Teacher Demonstration Days at least one time per quarter, centered around our school-wide priorities. Teachers will implement their learning with actionable feedback from the administrative team walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmittiel (schmittiel@pcsb.org)

By When:

9. Provide opportunities beyond the classroom walls for student experiences related to content learning.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmitt diel (schmitt diel@pcsb.org)

By When:

10. Continue promotion of our College and Career Center to ensure all students have opportunity to explore relevant information regarding their future planning.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmitt diel (schmitt diel@pcsb.org)

By When:

11. Generate systematic approach to increase promotional opportunities centered around student interest and potential for future cohorts.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmitt diel (schmitt diel@pcsb.org)

By When:

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

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

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

Our current level of performance is 98%, as evidenced in the 2022-2023 school's graduation rate data. Our continued growth will be addressed by focusing on student-centered instruction and engagement, cognitively complex tasks through WICOR, and maximizing instructional time each day. With this focus, there will be an increase in the graduation rate to 100%, providing an equitable educational opportunity for ALL students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of students graduating on-time with their cohort will increase from 98% graduation rate to 100%, as measured by the end of the 2023-24 school year graduating cohort data.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored via consistent progress checks for our seniors with administration, guidance, our College and Career Center Coordinator, and various school leaders through the Child Study Team to ensure that appropriate supports are in place to meet the needs of ALL students.

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.)

- Intensify graduation committee focus on data to proactively plan interventions and supports for individual students.
- Strengthen staff ability to engage students for on-track promotion throughout high school.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in complex tasks.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize questions at the appropriate complexity to help students elaborate and work toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in Focused Note Taking (FNT) to ensure that they effectively process, connect, reflect, and apply their notes and learning, assisting in progression toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize formative assessment strategies throughout each class period to monitor student progress toward mastery of the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By effectively monitoring students through consistent monitoring both Tier 1 and Tier 2/3 Students (through CST), student graduation rate will increase.

Additionally, by providing ongoing professional development opportunities surrounding student-centered instruction and engagement and cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Notetaking and collaboration strategies), teachers will continue to strengthen their pedagogical practices, which will result in ALL students engaging in rigorous tasks in the classroom at an appropriate cognitive level.

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.

1. Evaluate and implement PBIS system for tier 1 supports for ALL students schoolwide.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmittiel (schmittiel@pcsb.org)

By When:

2. Closely monitor and provide tier 1 supports for ALL students as they progress toward meeting cohort graduation requirements.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmittiel (schmittiel@pcsb.org)

By When:

3. Develop universal reporting system for teachers to report student concerns and identify different interventions they've provided, for the Child Study Team to look at next steps in terms of possible more intensive interventions.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmittiel (schmittiel@pcsb.org)

By When:

4. Collaborate with teacher leaders and administrative team in leadership meetings, utilizing formative and summative assessment data to track student progress toward completion of graduation requirements, identifying at-risk students to ensure appropriate supports are provided.

Person Responsible: Daniel Schmittiel (schmittiel@pcsb.org)

By When:

#7. 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.

Our current level of performance has a 7% FAST PM3 ELA proficiency gap between white and black students, as evidenced by the 2023 FAST PM3 ELA assessment. Our continued growth will be addressed by focusing on student-centered instruction and engagement, cognitively complex tasks through WICOR, and maximizing instructional time each day, along with Restorative Practices. With this focus, the gap will be eliminated to 0%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of black students displaying proficiency on the FAST PM3 ELA assessment will increase to reduce the achievement gap between white and black students from 7% to 0% or better, as measured by consistent formative assessments, district assessments, ongoing state testing, and the 2023-24 FAST PM3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored throughout the school year with classroom walkthroughs and actionable feedback, along with active participation in Data Driven PLCs, to ensure that data drives daily instructional practices. We will also analyze cycle assessment data via Data Driven PLCs to address global (and individualized) areas of need to develop ongoing remediation and spiraled instruction plans as needed.

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.)

- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in complex tasks.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize questions at the appropriate complexity to help students elaborate and work toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in Focused Note Taking (FNT) to ensure that they effectively process, connect, reflect, and apply their notes and learning, assisting in progression toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize formative assessment strategies throughout each class period to monitor student progress toward mastery of the standards.
- Implement Restorative Practices throughout the school

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Each of the strategies were specifically chosen to address the various components of bridging the gap (i.e. graduation rate, student achievement, advanced coursework, student discipline, and minority hiring).

Additionally, by providing ongoing professional development opportunities surrounding student-centered instruction and engagement and cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Note-Taking and collaboration strategies), teachers will continue to strengthen their pedagogical practices, which will result in ALL students engaging in rigorous tasks in the classroom at an appropriate cognitive level.

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.

1. Continue the increased use of community building circles and strategies within the classroom that develop relationships, to prevent problem behaviors in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

2. Teachers engage in district led professional learning opportunities and district core specific PLCs, along with collaborating with district Staff Developers at the school throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

3. Teachers engage in pre-school and ongoing professional development in and implement strategies surrounding student-centered instruction and engagement, cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Note-Taking and collaboration strategies) to support learning for ALL students equitably.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

4. Teachers utilize daily formative assessment strategies to check for understanding, using that data to gauge student progress toward mastery of the standard, centered around both classroom formative and summative assessments and course specific available resources (i.e. Albert.io, IXL, AP Classroom, Marco Learning). Teachers utilize the formative assessment data to drive instructional practices both in the moment and for future lessons.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

5. Provide students opportunities to take ownership of their data, centered around units and cycle assessments.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

6. Teachers intentionally plan lessons to engage students in cognitively complex tasks through various WICOR strategies (i.e. Focused Note-Taking and collaborative strategies), to provide rigorous learning opportunities within the classroom each day.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

7. Teachers and administrative team engage in Data Driven PLCs to analyze common assessment data (formative and summative), to drive instructional practices within the classroom. Data is utilized to determine remediation and extension needs to meet the diverse needs of our learners.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

8. Administrative team conducts walkthroughs to provide actionable feedback surrounding strategies tied to our school-wide priorities.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

9. Teachers and administrative team collaborate in Strategy Walks with a structured debrief/planning session via Teacher Demonstration Days at least one time per quarter, centered around our school-wide priorities. Teachers will implement their learning with actionable feedback from the administrative team walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Megan Hatfield (hatfieldm@pcsb.org)

By When:

10. Increase opportunity to actively promote involvement in clubs (i.e. SGA, NHS, etc.) and college level coursework surrounding student interests and strengths.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#8. 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.

Our current level of performance is 24% for our students with disabilities, as evidenced by the 2023 FAST PM3 ELA assessment. Our continued growth will be addressed by focusing on student-centered instruction and engagement, cognitively complex tasks through WICOR, and maximizing instructional time each day, along with Restorative Practices. With this focus, there will be a student increase of 26% or more.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of students with disabilities displaying proficiency on the FAST PM3 ELA assessment will increase from 24% to 50% or greater, as measured by the FAST PM3 ELA assessment during the 2023-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored throughout the school year with classroom walkthroughs and actionable feedback, along with active participation in Data Driven PLCs, to ensure that data drives daily instructional practices. We will also analyze cycle assessment data via Data Driven PLCs to address global (and individualized) areas of need to develop ongoing remediation and spiraled instruction plans as needed.

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.)

- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in complex tasks.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize questions at the appropriate complexity to help students elaborate and work toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in Focused Note Taking (FNT) to ensure that they effectively process, connect, reflect, and apply their notes and learning, assisting in progression toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize formative assessment strategies throughout each class period to monitor student progress toward mastery of the standards.
- Implement Restorative Practices throughout the school

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing ongoing professional development opportunities surrounding student-centered instruction and engagement and cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Note-Taking and collaboration strategies), teachers will continue to strengthen their pedagogical practices, which will result in ALL students engaging in rigorous tasks in the classroom at an appropriate cognitive level.

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.

1. General Education Teachers and ESE Teachers will collaborate to ensure students are receiving Specially Designed Instruction for students with disabilities, supported by district resources for different EOC content areas, to engage students in cognitively complex tasks, providing students opportunity to meet and exceed the rigor of the standards in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

2. Teachers engage in district led professional learning opportunities and district core specific PLCs, along with collaborating with district Staff Developers at the school throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

3. Teachers engage in pre-school and ongoing professional development in and implement strategies surrounding student-centered instruction and engagement, cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Note-Taking and collaboration strategies) to support learning for ALL students equitably.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

4. Teachers utilize daily formative assessment strategies to check for understanding, using that data to gauge student progress toward mastery of the standard, centered around both classroom formative and summative assessments and course specific available resources (i.e. Albert.io, IXL, AP Classroom, Marco Learning). Teachers utilize the formative assessment data to drive instructional practices both in the moment and for future lessons.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

5. Provide students opportunities to take ownership of their data, centered around units and cycle assessments.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

6. Teachers intentionally plan lessons to engage students in cognitively complex tasks through various WICOR strategies (i.e. Focused Note-Taking and collaborative strategies), to provide rigorous learning opportunities within the classroom each day.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

7. Teachers and administrative team engage in Data Driven PLCs to analyze common assessment data (formative and summative), to drive instructional practices within the classroom. Data is utilized to determine remediation and extension needs to meet the diverse needs of our learners.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

8. Administrative team conducts walkthroughs to provide actionable feedback surrounding strategies tied to our school-wide priorities.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

9. Teachers and administrative team collaborate in Strategy Walks with a structured debrief/planning session via Teacher Demonstration Days at least one time per quarter, centered around our school-wide priorities. Teachers will implement their learning with actionable feedback from the administrative team walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

#9. 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.

Our current level of performance is 28% for our English Language Learners, as evidenced by the 2023 FAST PM3 ELA assessment. Our continued growth will be addressed by focusing on student-centered instruction and engagement, cognitively complex tasks through WICOR, and maximizing instructional time each day, along with Restorative Practices. With this focus, there will be a student increase of 22% or more.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of our English Language Learners displaying proficiency on the FAST PM3 ELA assessment will increase from 28% to 50% or greater, as measured by the FAST PM3 ELA assessment during the 2023-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored throughout the school year with classroom walkthroughs and actionable feedback, along with active participation in Data Driven PLCs, to ensure that data drives daily instructional practices. We will also analyze cycle assessment data via Data Driven PLCs to address global (and individualized) areas of need to develop ongoing remediation and spiraled instruction plans as needed.

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.)

- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in complex tasks.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize questions at the appropriate complexity to help students elaborate and work toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in Focused Note Taking (FNT) to ensure that they effectively process, connect, reflect, and apply their notes and learning, assisting in progression toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize formative assessment strategies throughout each class period to monitor student progress toward mastery of the standards.
- Implement Restorative Practices throughout the school

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing ongoing professional development opportunities surrounding student-centered instruction and engagement and cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Note-Taking and collaboration strategies), teachers will continue to strengthen their pedagogical practices, which will result in ALL students engaging in rigorous tasks in the classroom at an appropriate cognitive level.

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.

1. Teachers collaborate with our ESOL Coordinator to ensure that appropriate supports are in place based on the Can-Do-Descriptors to support the diverse needs of English Language Learners.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

2. Teachers engage in district led professional learning opportunities and district core specific PLCs, along with collaborating with district Staff Developers at the school throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

3. Teachers engage in pre-school and ongoing professional development in and implement strategies surrounding student-centered instruction and engagement, cognitively complex tasks through WICOR (i.e. Focused Note-Taking and collaboration strategies) to support learning for ALL students equitably.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

4. Teachers utilize daily formative assessment strategies to check for understanding, using that data to gauge student progress toward mastery of the standard, centered around both classroom formative and summative assessments and course specific available resources (i.e. Albert.io, IXL, AP Classroom, Marco Learning). Teachers utilize the formative assessment data to drive instructional practices both in the moment and for future lessons.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

5. Provide students opportunities to take ownership of their data, centered around units and cycle assessments.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

6. Teachers intentionally plan lessons to engage students in cognitively complex tasks through various WICOR strategies (i.e. Focused Note-Taking and collaborative strategies), to provide rigorous learning opportunities within the classroom each day.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

7. Teachers and administrative team engage in Data Driven PLCs to analyze common assessment data (formative and summative), to drive instructional practices within the classroom. Data is utilized to determine remediation and extension needs to meet the diverse needs of our learners.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

8. Administrative team conducts walkthroughs to provide actionable feedback surrounding strategies tied to our school-wide priorities.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

9. Teachers and administrative team collaborate in Strategy Walks with a structured debrief/planning session via Teacher Demonstration Days at least one time per quarter, centered around our school-wide priorities. Teachers will implement their learning with actionable feedback from the administrative team walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

#10. 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.

Regarding student's skipping classes, during the 2022-23 school year our rising 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students received 107 referrals, as evidenced our student discipline records. By implementing our new schoolwide PBIS system, we will increase student and staff buy-in at East Lake High School, as measured by student surveys, participation in PBIS activities, and the use of positive referrals/rewards. This will lead to a more positive school climate and culture and a decrease in skipping referrals by at least 25%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By increase student and staff buy-in surrounding our newly modified schoolwide PBIS system, we will decrease the amount of skipping referrals by at least 25% and increase the school climate and culture, as measured by 2023-24 discipline data, student surveys, participation in PBIS activities, and the use of positive referrals/rewards.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored throughout the school year with classroom walkthroughs and actionable feedback, along with active participation in our PBIS committee meetings (representation from all departments), along with providing opportunities for students and staff to provide feedback throughout the year. We will also monitor student discipline data weekly as an admin team and biweekly with MTSS to ensure that tier 2 and tier 3 interventions are put in place for students needing extra supports beyond our PBIS system.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to engage students in complex tasks.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice to utilize questions at the appropriate complexity to help students elaborate and work toward mastery of the standards.
- Strengthen staff pedagogical practice surrounding the implementation of our PBIS system schoolwide.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing ongoing professional development opportunities surrounding our new schoolwide PBIS system, staff and student buy-in will increase which will result in an improved school culture and climate centered around positive reinforcement, having a direct correlation to a decrease in skipping referrals at East Lake High School.

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.

1. Teachers engage in pre-school and ongoing professional development surrounding new schoolwide PBIS system, with supports from our PBIS committee.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

2. Collect and analyze student and staff feedback at least one time per quarter to evaluate our PBIS system and determine next steps/modifications.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

3. Analyze student discipline data with admin team (weekly) and MTSS (biweekly) to identify impact on student discipline and need for tier 2/tier 3 supports for individual students.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

4. Identify mentors for tier 2 and tier 3 supports for students in need throughout the school year and generate on-track contract to promote the increase of desired behaviors, attendance, and grades.

Person Responsible: Chiquita Godwin (godwinch@pcsb.org)

By When:

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).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.