

Pinellas County Schools

Pinellas Virtual Franchise 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	32
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	32
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pinellas Virtual Franchise

305 4TH AVE SW, Largo, FL 33770

virtualschool.pcsb.org

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.

Expanding access for all Pinellas County students to rigorous, relevant curriculum that incorporates skills and knowledge students need to succeed in the 21st century.

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
Perry, Mandy	Principal	<p>The Principal provides instructional leadership for the planning, management, operation and evaluation of the Pinellas Virtual School. The Principal works with teachers to ensure that each child successfully completes their instructional program. The Principal manages the overall school operation working with parents, students, support staff and certified teachers who "virtually" facilitate a student instructional program.</p> <p>The Principal manages Pinellas Virtual School and its Human Resources to attain school goals by providing evidence of effective instruction that results in student achievement, as recognized through defined learning gains and survey results. The Principal supports the instructional process with specific responsibility for managing all programs/services; providing information and serving as a resource to others; and supervising all staff. The Principal will also oversee personal and professional growth activities of assigned staff.</p>
Fresia, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Team leader, provide instructional coaching, facilitate training and monitor data.
Hall, Marcia	Teacher, K-12	Team leader, provide instructional coaching, facilitate training and monitor data.
O'Keefe, Timothy	Teacher, K-12	Team leader, provide instructional coaching, facilitate training and monitor data.
Stradling, Lori	Teacher, ESE	Team leader, provide instructional coaching, facilitate training and monitor data.
Tompkins, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Team leader, provide instructional coaching, facilitate training and monitor data.
Whitehurst, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Team leader, provide instructional coaching, facilitate training and monitor data.
Irizarry, Evelyn	School Counselor	Provides student data information and information on services and programs available to students. Provides school counseling services and monitors data.
Meloy, Carlene	Instructional Coach	Works with teachers to ensure that each child successfully completes their instructional program and provides information and serves as a resource to teachers, develops and provides professional growth activities

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 input was provided via SAC meetings and through ongoing course and district surveys. This important information has lead to increased live lesson opportunities, guided notes, and differentiation in discussion based assessments all focused on increase student engagement and content mastery.

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))

The SIP is monitored weekly through classroom walkthroughs that review student progress in online courses as well as through assessment monitoring of FAST. Student schedules are updated to provide additional supports as needed and indicated through the data.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	20%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B 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	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	9	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	8	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	2	4	15	
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	1	0	0	0	1	3	5

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	1	0	1	2	1	3	4	18	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	3	9	32	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	10	9	7	9	75	
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		

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	2	0	2

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	9	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3	3	11	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	3	5	1	3	1	15	
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		

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	2	0	2

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	School	2022		School	2019	
		District	State		District	State
ELA Achievement*	64	63	57	73	70	61
ELA Learning Gains	57	56	55	60	63	59
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33	42	46	58	56	54
Math Achievement*	45	65	55	70	72	62
Math Learning Gains	45	60	60	61	63	59
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41	51	56		54	52
Science Achievement*	63	58	51	59	64	56
Social Studies Achievement*	76	82	72	90	81	78
Middle School Acceleration	54			55		
Graduation Rate	88					
College and Career Acceleration	42					
ELP Progress						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	608
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	88

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	66			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	46			

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	64	57	33	45	45	41	63	76	54	88	42	
SWD	31	36	42	23	41	36	40	63				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	37		22	17	30	54	38				
HSP	80	69		51	56		71	71		93	38	
MUL	60	63		45	42							
PAC												
WHT	61	56	30	47	48	42	62	85	54	91	46	
FRL	56	48	29	37	38	32	50	62	40	76	42	

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	69	56	46	53	41	34	71	75	55	92	29	
SWD	43	39		22	22			75				
ELL				45								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	65	46		15	25							
HSP	61	47	33	44	33	20	52	73				
MUL	56	36		47	31							
PAC												
WHT	71	60	48	59	44	46	75	75	56	89	29	
FRL	58	44	50	40	36	30	64	73	31			

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	73	60	58	70	61		59	90	55			
SWD												
ELL												

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75	58		69	60		63	90	60			
FRL	79	50		67	64			91				

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	79%	48%	31%	50%	29%
05	2023 - Spring	71%	57%	14%	54%	17%
07	2023 - Spring	73%	48%	25%	47%	26%
08	2023 - Spring	71%	47%	24%	47%	24%
09	2023 - Spring	68%	46%	22%	48%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	*	58%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	71%	47%	24%	47%	24%
03	2023 - Spring	54%	53%	1%	50%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	67%	58%	9%	54%	13%
07	2023 - Spring	70%	36%	34%	48%	22%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	62%	0%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	*	66%	*	61%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	88%	61%	27%	55%	33%
05	2023 - Spring	36%	61%	-25%	55%	-19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	71%	47%	24%	44%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	71%	60%	11%	51%	20%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	53%	6%	50%	9%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	46%	4%	48%	2%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	59%	27%	63%	23%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	68%	8%	66%	10%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	59%	14%	63%	10%

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.

Elementary Math data component shows the lowest performance at 56% proficiency. Contributing factors include need for additional supports and targeted interventions that include student and teacher working on proficiency in real-time environment with smaller group settings. There is evidence that current intervention practices are working as we have seen an 11% increase in proficiency since 21-22 school year.

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

Our graduation rate shows the greatest decline from the prior year as it decreased by 2%. Our graduation rate lowered as students did not complete courses or participate in state testing during subsequent school years leading to an over all decline in graduates.

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.

The greatest gap is 5th grade math when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include need for additional supports and targeted interventions that include student and teacher working on proficiency in real-time environment with smaller group settings.

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

The most improved data component came in our science proficiency. Pinellas Virtual School increased the number of opportunities for synchronous learning for students and provided synchronous EOC and NGSSS standard review sessions with teacher created asynchronous reviews posted in courses for student usage.

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

Students scoring Level 1 on Math in grades K-5.

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

- 1) Improve Elementary Math Scores
- 2) Improve Graduation Rate

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 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.

Upon review of state assessment data we saw increasing achievement in math overall, but a decline in school performance versus state performance for grade 4. All other grades levels increased in proficiency with the highest increase in proficiency found in Algebra 1. The school continues to underperform in proficiency for math below the state and district levels in grades 3, 4 and 5. Black and Students with Disabilities will have an emphasis placed on differentiated math instruction. Students with Disabilities will attend Specially Designed Instruction for math in a synchronous setting to ensure content mastery. We will deepen understanding of Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards for Mathematics as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of May 2024, student achievement in Math grade 3 will increase by 4%.

By the end of May 2024, student achievement in Math grade 4 will increase by 36%.

By the end of May 2023, student achievement in Math grade 5 will increase by 20%.

By the end of May 2023, student achievement in Geometry will increase by 5%.

We have made these achievements in Math grades 6, 7, 8, and Algebra 1 and will continue to maintain these performance gains.

Monitoring:

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

Math universal screening will occur at regular intervals through IXL, Dreambox, and Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), for all Kindergarten through 8th grade students, including those enrolled in Algebra and Geometry. This will also include all 11th and 12th grade students who have not met the Algebra 1 EOC assessment requirement for graduation. Student data will be monitored and analyzed to ensure progress is being achieved throughout the school year. Data will be shared with math instructors in order to support differentiated instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mandy Perry (perrym@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.)

"In the context of an RTI prevention model, universal screening is the first step in identifying the students who are at risk for learning difficulties. It is the mechanism for targeting students who struggle to learn when provided a scientific, evidence-based general education (Jenkins, Hudson, & Johnson, 2007). Universal screening is typically conducted three times per school year: fall, winter, and spring. Universal screening measures consist of brief assessments focused on target skills that are high predictive of future outcomes (Jenkins, 2003) <http://www.rtinetwork.org/learn/research/universalscreening-within-a-rti-model>.

The established math goals will be used to focus learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Progress monitoring is an assessment technique which tells educators areas of student strength and weakness related to benchmarks and standards. Collected data allows instructors to adjust instruction and differentiated based on student needs. Through regular assessment intervals instructors are able to

determine if strategies used are effective and can provide further remediation if needed.

Through increased training and focus on instruction, instructors will understand and implement strategies to support students who struggle. Tier 1 and Tier 2 instructional strategies will be used to support students in areas of achievement and learning gains.

Learning expectations will be communicated in terms of goals that are appropriate, challenging and attainable. The goals will be specific and revisited during the online lesson and synchronous learning opportunities to ensure they are clear to students.

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.

Universal screening through IXL and Dreambox will occur at varying intervals as needed and through FAST, Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking during PM 1 (fall) and PM 2 (winter).

Person Responsible: Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)

By When: Screening 1 by mid-September and Screening 2 by end of semester 1.

Math teachers will track T2 instructional strategies and compare to assessment data to determine if differentiated instructional methods are effectively making an impact on student learning. Math teachers will analyze subgroup assessment data with special focus on Black and Students with Disabilities to collaborate and share best practices through our organized Data Days

Person Responsible: Michael Fresia (fresiam@pcsb.org)

By When: October 1 and January 15

Teachers and administrators implement and facilitate a goal setting environment where students regularly and visibly participate in setting their own goals, monitor academic progress throughout the year, revise goals based on data, and celebrate success.

Person Responsible: Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)

By When: October 1 and January 15

K-5 Math teachers will supplement curriculum with paper worksheets related to content material.

Person Responsible: Marcia Hall (hallmarc@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of each month ongoing until the end of school.

K-5 Math teachers will support and supplement through the use of Dreambox for L1 and L2 students.

Person Responsible: Marcia Hall (hallmarc@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of each month ongoing until the end of school.

#2. 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.

Cultivating a supportive environment for all students. This is a central part of success in the virtual school as evident in our Learning Coach requirement. Students with Disabilities have additional supports through Specially Designed Instruction that allows for synchronous learning with ESE teacher to improve relationships with student-teacher. Black students are invited to attend a synchronous events both online and in person to increase the sense of belonging.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increased student survey responses to 97% state they feel their teacher cares about their success.
Increased academic achievement on assessments.
Increased successful completions in online courses to 80%.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly surveys will be reviewed and shared with teachers.
PM1 and PM 2 will be shared with teaches on specific data days to use in data chats with students.
Completions rates will be monitored monthly and included in data day discussions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mandy Perry (perrym@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.)

In a student-centered classroom, students feel valued as their teacher establishes and maintains effective relationships and relates content to the lives of each student. The teacher uses feedback to maintain an academic focus. (Marzano) Teacher uses equity and attends to the individual needs of students to ensure that a relationship is in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who have close, positive and supportive relationships with their teachers attain higher levels of achievement. (American Psychological Association)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will foster student growth by providing specific feedback on all writing assignments. Feedback is designed to inform students of what they did well and areas where they could improve. Students are encouraged to utilize this feedback to reassess and resubmit their submissions.

Person Responsible: Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)

By When: End of Semester 1 End of Semester 2

Teacher-student relationships will support students during discussion based assessments. This allows for reteaching of standards for mastery of content. In order to provide support, teachers will start these conversations with higher order thinking questions, and then scaffold the questions when needed to build student confidence and success.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: End of Semester 1 End of Semester 2

Students and parents will receive surveys at intervals of the online class to provide feedback on conditions for learning. Data will be reviewed and shared on monthly with discussions for improvement.

Person Responsible: Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly starting in September throughout the school year.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

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

Upon review of state assessment data we saw increasing achieve in ELA from grades 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, but decreases in grade 3. Overall we performed higher in ELA then state and district,. An emphasis will be placed on differentiated ELA instruction for Black and Students with Disabilities subgroups to improve student learning in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By end of May 2023, student achievement in grade 3 will increase by 5%
 By end of May 2023, student achievement in grade 4 will increase by 2%
 By end of May 2023, student achievement in grade 5 will increase by 2%
 By end of May 2023, student achievement in grade 6 will increase by 2%
 By end of May 2023, student achievement in grade 7 will increase by 2%
 By end of May 2023, student achievement in grade 8 will increase by 2%
 By end of May 2023, student achievement in grade 9 will increase by 3%
 By end of May 2023, student achievement in grade 10 will increase by 1%

Monitoring:

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

ELA universal screening will occur at regular intervals through face-to-face FAST, Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking, for all Kindergarten through 10th Grade students as well as 11th and 12th grade students who have not met the ELA assessment requirement for graduation. Student data will be monitored and analyzed to ensure progress is being achieved throughout the school year. Data will be shared with ELA and reading instructors in order to support differentiated instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mandy Perry (perrym@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.)

"In context of an RTI prevention model, universal screening is the first step in identifying the students who are at risk for learning difficulties. It is the mechanism for targeting students who struggle to learn when provided a scientific, evidence-based general education (Jenkins, Hudson, & Johnson, 2007). Universal screening is typically conducted three times per school year: fall, winter, and spring. Universal screening measures consist of brief assessments focused on target skills that are highly predictive of future outcomes (Jenkins, 2003). "<http://www.rtinetwork.org/learn/research/universalscreening-within-a-rti-model>.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Progress monitoring is an assessment technique which tells educators areas of student strength and weakness related to benchmarks and standards. Collected data allows instructors to adjust instruction and differentiate based on student needs. Through regular assessment intervals instructors are able to determine if strategies used are effective and can provide further remediation if needed.

Through increase training and focus on instruction, instructors will understand and implement strategies to

support students who struggle. Tier 1 and Tier 2 instructional strategies will be used to support students in areas of achievement and learning gains.

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.

Universal screening through FAST, Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking during PM 1 (fall) and PM 2 (winter).

Person Responsible: Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)

By When: By mid-September By mid- January

ELA teachers will track T2 instructional strategies and compare to assessment data to determine if differentiated instructional methods are effectively making an impact on student learning. ELA teachers will analyze subgroup assessment data and collaborate to share best practices through our organized Data Days.

Person Responsible: Karen Whitehurst (whitehurstka@pcsb.org)

By When: By mid-September By mid-January

ELA teachers will provide study guides for Discussion Based Assessments (DBAs) and review of guided notes.

Person Responsible: Karen Whitehurst (whitehurstka@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of each month until the end of the school year.

Offer additional live lessons and help session to small groups.

Person Responsible: Karen Whitehurst (whitehurstka@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of each month until the end of the school year.

ELA teachers will use iStation K-5 for additional support and supplementation for L1 and L2 students.

Person Responsible: Marcia Hall (hallmarc@pcsb.org)

By When: By mid-September By mid-January

#4. 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.

Upon review of state assessment data we saw increasing achievement in Science from grades 5 and 8, as well as increases in the Biology EOC. Overall students performed higher than state and district. An emphasis will be placed on differentiated instruction for Science with Black and Students with Disabilities subgroups to improve learning in Science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By end of May 2023, student achievement in grade 5 will increase by 2%.

By end of May 2023, student achievement in grade 8 will increase by 2%.

By end of May 2023, student achievement in Biology will increase by 1%.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will log student attendance, and a description of live lesson content in VSA. Administration will review these logs for fidelity, bi-annually, through VSA and Educator walk throughs. Teachers will monitor whole group and small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mandy Perry (perrym@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.)

Learning gains will be evaluated throughout the semester through discussion based assessments, module exams, and final exams. Student progress will also be reviewed to demonstrate successful completion of courses without the use of extensions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through monitoring student data, and providing skill specific opportunities for review and mastery, student learning gains will increase on Science formatives. Discussion Based Assessments allow students to communicate opinions and thoughts, while allowing the teacher to see if students have master the concepts taught.

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.

Live lessons will focus on teaching concepts and skills centered on the Florida's State Academic Standards for Science (FSASS).

Person Responsible: Timothy O'Keefe (okeefet@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing weekly through end of school year.

Prior to FSASS and the Biology EOC teachers will incorporate test prep and study skills into Live Lessons and Discussion Based Assessments (DBAs).

Person Responsible: Timothy O'Keefe (okeefet@pcsb.org)

By When: By March 2024

Science teachers will provide study guides for Discussion Based Assessments (DBAs) and a review of guided notes.

Person Responsible: Timothy O'Keefe (okeefet@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing weekly through end of school year.

Offer additional live lesson sessions with smaller groups.

Person Responsible: Timothy O'Keefe (okeefet@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing weekly through end of school year.

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Upon review of state assessment data we saw increasing achievement in Civics and decreasing achievement in US History EOCs. Overall we outperformed in Social Studies both state and district. An emphasis will be placed on differentiated instruction for Black and Students with Disabilities Subgroups to improve student learning in Social Studies.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of May 2024, student achievement in Civics will increase 2%

By the end of May 2023, student achievement in US History will increase 5%

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will log student attendance, and a description of live lesson content in VSA. Administration will review these logs for fidelity, bi-annually, through VSA and Educator walk throughs. Teachers will monitor whole group and small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mandy Perry (perrym@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.)

Learning gains will be evaluated throughout the semester through discussion based assessments, module exams, and final exams. Student progress will also be reviewed to demonstrate successful completion of courses without the use of extensions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through monitoring student data, and providing skill specific opportunities for review and mastery, student learning gains will increase on Social Studies formatives. Discussion Based Assessments allow students to communicate opinions and thoughts, while allowing the teacher to see if students have master the concepts taught.

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.

Live lessons will focus on teaching concepts and skills.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Tompkins (tompkinsel@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing weekly through end of school year.

Prior to Civics and the US History EOC teachers will incorporate test prep and study skills into Live Lessons and Discussion Based Assessments (DBAs).

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Tompkins (tompkinsel@pcsb.org)

By When: By March 2024

Science teachers will provide study guides for Discussion Based Assessments (DBAs) and a review of guided notes.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Tompkins (tompkinsel@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing weekly through end of school year.

Offer additional live lesson sessions with smaller groups.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Tompkins (tompkinsel@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing weekly through end of school year.

#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.

Ensure school has systems of support for meeting state graduation standards to meet the personalized needs of ALL students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By end of May 2024, student graduation rate will be 90%.

Monitoring:

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

The PCS Cohort Reporting System will be utilized as needed and appropriate to progress monitor each factor impacting graduation rate and implementing interventions at the whole school, grade level, course level, or student level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mandy Perry (perrym@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.)

Set measures for success for counselor to meet with students to help them set goals. Increase communication with parents from monthly to weekly as needed to ensure student success. Ensure students engage in credit recover offered at schools in district. Provide success plans to help guide families to success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are needed to assist students by ensuring they complete all graduation requirements.

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.

11th and 12th grade transcripts will be reviewed to ensure they have a passing Algebra 1 EOC score or concordant test score and passing state test score for ELA/Reading (10th grade assessment) or concordant test score.

Person Responsible: Evelyn Irizarry (irizarrye@pcsb.org)

By When: By September 1, 2023

School counselor will provide T2 support to provide interventions and move to T3 for individual students needing additional interventions to graduate on time.

Person Responsible: Evelyn Irizarry (irizarrye@pcsb.org)

By When: By January 15, 2024

#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.

Upon review of student data assessment for 2023 we saw increasing achievement in ELA and decreasing achievement in Math for Black/African-American students. An emphasis will be placed on small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By end of May 2024, black student achievement in Math will increase by 5% and by 2% in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

ELA and Math universal screening will occur at regular intervals through face-to-face FAST, Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking, for all Black students Kindergarten through 10th grade, as well as, 11th and 12th grade student who have not meet the ELA or Algebra 1 assessment for graduation. Black student data will be monitored and analyzed to ensure progress is being achieved throughout the school year. Data will be shared with ELA and math instructors in order to support small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mandy Perry (perrym@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.)

Explicit and direct instructions using a systematic approach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Direct and explicit instructions will be used with students in small group instruction to ensure mastery. Working synchronously will allow for breaking lessons into sequential and manageable steps.

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.

Universal screening through FAST, Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking during PM1 (fall) and PM2 (winter)

Person Responsible: Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)

By When: By September 15, 2023 By January 15, 2024

ELA teachers will track T2 instructional strategies and compare to assessment data to determine if differentiated instructional methods are effectively making an impact on student learning. ELA teachers

will analyze subgroup assessment data and collaborate to share best practices through our organized data days.

Person Responsible: Karen Whitehurst (whitehurstka@pcsb.org)

By When: Beginning September 15 and ongoing through end of school year.

Math teachers will track T2 instructional strategies and compare to instructional strategies and compare to assessment data to determine if differentiated instructional methods are effectively making an impact on student learning. Math teachers will analyze subgroup assessment data and collaborate to share best practices through our organized data days.

Person Responsible: Michael Fresia (fresiam@pcsb.org)

By When: Beginning September 15 and ongoing through end of school year.

Teachers will provide study guides for Discussion Based Assessments (DBAs) and a review of guided notes

Person Responsible: Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)

By When: Beginning August 10 and ongoing through school year

Offer additional live lesson sessions with smaller groups

Person Responsible: Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)

By When: Beginning August 10 and ongoing through school year

#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.

Upon review of student data assessment for 2023 we saw increasing achievement in ELA and decreasing achievement in Math for Students with Disabilities. An emphasis will be placed on small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By end of May 2024, Students with Disabilities achievement in Math will increase by 5% and by 2% in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

ELA and Math universal screening will occur at regular intervals through face-to-face FAST, Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking, for all SWD Kindergarten through 10th grade, as well as, 11th and 12th grade student who have not meet the ELA or Algebra 1 assessment for graduation. SWD data will be monitored and analyzed to ensure progress is being achieved throughout the school year. Data will be shared with ELA and math instructors in order to support small group instruction. As well as ESE teachers providing specially designed instruction.

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.)

Explicit and direct instructions using a systematic approach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Direct and explicit instructions will be used with students in small group instruction to ensure mastery. Working synchronously will allow for breaking lessons into sequential and manageable steps.

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.

Universal screening through FAST, Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking during PM1 (fall) and PM2 (winter)

Person Responsible: Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)

By When: By September 15, 2023 By January 15, 2024

ELA teachers will track T2 instructional strategies and compare to assessment data to determine if differentiated instructional methods are effectively making an impact on student learning. ELA teachers

will analyze subgroup assessment data and collaborate to share best practices through our organized data days.

Person Responsible: Karen Whitehurst (whitehurstka@pcsb.org)

By When: Beginning September 15 and ongoing through end of school year.

Math teachers will track T2 instructional strategies and compare to instructional strategies and compare to assessment data to determine if differentiated instructional methods are effectively making an impact on student learning. Math teachers will analyze subgroup assessment data and collaborate to share best practices through our organized data days.

Person Responsible: Michael Fresia (fresiam@pcsb.org)

By When: Beginning September 15 and ongoing through end of school year.

Teachers will provide study guides for Discussion Based Assessments (DBAs) and a review of guided notes

Person Responsible: Lori Stradling (stradlingl@pcsb.org)

By When: Beginning August 10 and ongoing throughout school year.

Offer additional live lesson sessions with smaller groups or 1:1 with specific differential instruction related to the student's IEP

Person Responsible: Lori Stradling (stradlingl@pcsb.org)

By When: Beginning August 10 and ongoing throughout school year.

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).

School improvement funding allocations will purchases resources based on high needs of students, specifically students with learning disabilities and black students, toward meeting school learning goals. Progress on learning goals for students will be progress monitored throughout the year to ensure the resources are being utilized toward overall improvement and meeting school goals.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

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

Strategically focus on 3-5 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, and feedback.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Student progress will be monitored with iReady screening and FAST testing to ensure 50% or higher are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment. When PM1 is completed additional supplements will be added to those performing below grade level.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Student progress will be monitored with iReady screening and FAST testing to ensure 50% or higher are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment. When PM1 is completed additional supplements will be added to those performing below grade level.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Monitoring progress weekly in iStation to see weekly gains and utilizing small reading groups for those not making gains.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Perry, Mandy, perrym@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

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

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

- o Provides print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction
- o Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words
- o Reinforce the effectiveness of instruction in alphabets, fluency, and vocabulary
- o Provide instruction in broad oral language skills
- o Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies
- o Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension

Rationale:

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

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

To develop literacy, students need instruction in two related sets of skills: foundational reading skills and reading comprehension skills. Employing the evidence-based strategies and action steps will enable students to read words (alphabets), relate those words to their oral language, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency to understand what they read.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Literacy Leadership</p> <p>1) School Literacy Leadership Teams are meeting regularly to look at data to make informed decisions about what professional learning and supports need to be in place to maximize student growth in reading.</p> <p>2) Build capacity by identifying teachers, coaches and district staff who can support training in the use of evidence-based curriculum, instruction, and intervention aligned to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.</p>	<p>Perry, Mandy, perrym@pcsb.org</p>
<p>Professional learning</p> <p>1) Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are guided by assessment data and are ongoing, engaging, interactive, collaborative, and job-embedded and provide time for teachers to collaborate, research, conduct lesson studies, and plan instruction.</p> <p>2) School-based teams are provided professional learning sessions on the science of reading and evidence-based literacy instruction, materials, and assessment.</p> <p>3) School-based teams provide training to teachers that integrate the six components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language, comprehension, and vocabulary) into an explicit, systematic, and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies.</p>	<p>Meloy, Carlene, meloyc@pcsb.org</p>